

HARVARD THEOLOGICAL REVIEW

VOLUME XIV

APRIL, 1921

NUMBER 2

A DECADE OF LUTHER STUDY ¹

PRESERVED SMITH
CAMBRIDGE, MASSACHUSETTS

SINCE the last biographies of Luther in English appeared, nearly ten years ago, a vast amount of light has been shed on the subject by the discovery of new documents and by the intensive research of a great army of the learned. A special stimulus was supplied to their zeal by the celebration of the Reformation quadricentenary in 1917; and the fact that America was cut off from Germany for four years out of the last ten, and that the books of her production have only begun to reach us in large numbers, may add another reason, were it necessary, for offering an extensive review of the outstanding work in this field since the end of the year 1910. For the sake of convenience the more detailed studies will be taken up first, in the chronological order of events in Luther's life; the more general collections of works, bibliographies, biographies, and estimates, will follow after.

I. EARLY LIFE, 1483-1517

The German proverb,

Wer den Dichter will verstehen
Muss in des Dichters Heimat gehen,

is true of other great men besides poets. A good introduction to the beautiful scenery and historical relics of Eisenach and Mansfeld has been furnished by Kutzke ² and, on a much less pretentious scale, by Helen Kendall Smith.³ In this region Hans Luther "the Big" lived with his large family, and here

¹ Presented at the meeting of the American Society of Church History, December 27, 1920.

² G. Kutzke, *Aus Luthers Heimat*, 1914.

³ 'Luther Byways,' *Lutheran Survey*, October 23, 1918.

also lived another Hans Luther "the Little," his own brother, if we may believe Otto Scheel, whose thorough research has put him at the head of the authorities for this period of Martin's life.⁴ The other Hans Luther, if indeed we can accept the distinction made very remarkable by the same name for the brothers, may have been the rough character to whom Wicel's well-known anecdote that Luther's father fled from Eisenach because he had committed a murder applies. That Martin was the oldest son seems now to be settled, though Köhler credits a saying in the Table Talk that he was the second.⁵ From the fact that Luther, when matriculating at Erfurt on May 2, 1501, paid the full fee of thirty groschen, it has been inferred that his father at this time was in fairly comfortable circumstances.⁶ Much new light on Luther's student life may be derived not only from the researches of Neubauer, Bernay,⁷ and Scheel, but from the recent discovery, by H. Degering, of an old letter-book containing letters of Luther and his friends to their former teachers and pastor in Eisenach.⁸

One of these epistles, from the schoolmaster of Eisenach, Trebonius, dated February 5, 1505, speaks of Martin's good health and success, and holds him up as a model to the addressee of the missive, Lewis Han. Three of the letters are attributed by Degering to Luther, one dated April 28, 1507, inviting a teacher to his first mass, and signed by his name, being almost universally accepted as genuine. Another letter, unsigned, dated February 23, 1503, modestly disclaims the praise bestowed upon the writer by his correspondent, asks to borrow a book of Lyra, and apologizes for having eaten and drunken too much. This letter, though defended by Paquier as a welcome proof of the Reformer's early intemperance, has

⁴ Otto Scheel, *Martin Luther: Vom Katholizismus zur Reformation*. 2 vols. 1917 (vol. i in 2d ed.). On the two Hans Luthers, see Scheel, i, 6; Buchwald, *Lutherkalender*, 1910, and *Luther's Correspondence*, i, 22, note 2.

⁵ 'Luther,' in *Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart*, iii (1912), col. 2412. Against this, Scheel, i, 3.

⁶ T. T. Neubauer, *Luthers Frühzeit*, 1917, p. 46 (*Jahrbücher d. k. Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Erfurt*, N. F. xliii).

⁷ F. Bernay, *Zur Geschichte der Stadt und der Universität Erfurt am Ausgange des Mittelalters*, 1919.

⁸ Published in *Zentralblatt für Bibliothekswesen*, xxxiii, 1916.

been rejected by all other scholars, and in my opinion rightly.⁹ On the third letter, dated September 5, 1501, and signed "Martinus Viropolitanus" or "Martin of Mansfeld City," there is much difference of opinion. Neubauer, Böhmer and Scheel reject it; Kawerau and Flemming are undecided; but I concur with Freitag in regarding it as perfectly genuine and a valuable new light on the boy's student days. In order to enable English readers to judge for themselves I here translate it:¹⁰

*Luther to John Braun at Eisenach*¹¹

PORTA COELI, ERFURT, SEPTEMBER 5, 1501

Greeting. Kindest of men. Joyfully I received both your messenger and your salutations chosen for me, by which I learn that your kindness towards me has not only not diminished but has even increased. I quite rejoice; and for the special and familiar benevolence with which you visit me, although I am not able to return fitting thanks, yet I have great and immortal gratitude, for you sufficiently deserve this from me more than from any mortal.

Now, to satisfy your curiosity, know that fair fortune and good health are mine, and that, by the favor of the saints,¹² I am settled here as pleasantly as possible. Nor would I have you ignorant that I am serving under that teacher of liberal arts N.,¹³ my countryman, at the house of Porta Coeli.¹⁴

⁹ Paquier, *Luther et l'Allemagne*, 1918, p. 95; Köhler in *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, xxxiii, 19; Kawerau in *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, 1916, col. 331 f.; Freitag in *Historische Zeitschrift*, cxix, 247 f., and *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte*, xiii, 24. Freitag thinks the letter from Han to Trebonius.

¹⁰ Scheel, *op. cit.*, i (2d ed.), 140, and note on p. 293. The most thorough discussion is in Neubauer, *op. cit.*, pp. 153 ff. (1) He says Luther would not have been guilty of writing the hybrid word "Viropolitanus," and that it means "Manstedt," not Mansfeld, but I think it means the city as distinguished from the county of Mansfeld. (2) He thinks there is difficulty in identifying the teacher of whom Luther speaks as fellow-countryman, but this is not convincing. (3) He says that Luther's known teacher, J. Greffenstein (John Ansorg of Gräfenstein, on whom see *ibid.*, pp. 225 ff.), was not at Porta Caeli. (4) He says that Luther was at Bursa of St. George, not at Porta Caeli. But he might have changed. Cf. also Biereye, *Die Erfurter Lutherstätten nach ihrer geschichtlicher Begläubigung*, 1917; P. Flemming in *Luthers Briefwechsel*, xvii, 1920, p. 83; W. Köhler, in *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, xxxiii, 19. H. Böhmer, *Luther im Lichte der neueren Forschung*,⁵ 1918, p. 309 doubts the genuineness of all three letters.

¹¹ Enders, *Luthers Briefwechsel*, xvii, 82; *Zentralblatt für Bibliothekswesen*, xxxiii (1916), 78.

¹² *Diis faventibus*, "by favor of the gods," meant the same as the "favor of the saints" at this period.

¹³ According to Degering's note, *loc. cit.*, this teacher was John Greffenstein.

¹⁴ This was a foundation for the support of poor students: a full account of it in O. Scheel, *Luther*, i (2d ed., 1917), and A. Freitag in *Historische Zeitschrift*, cxix (1919), 247 ff.

This is due to the persuasion of my generous kinsmen when I visited my father's house. But this is nothing to you.

Finally I beg and beseech you to bear it patiently that so long a time has passed without my sending you a letter. Could I have done so I should have complied with your wishes thus, for indeed long ago I had two letters ready to be taken to you, but I could not find a messenger.

Last of all, as I close, please give my warm greetings to your neighbor.^{14a} Farewell, most revered of men.

Martin of Mansfeld, your honorary umpire.¹⁵ To N., the soldier of the Lord.¹⁶

The problem of Luther's inner development from the day he took the vow to be a monk until the day when the message came to him, with such force that he believed it to be a revelation of the Holy Ghost, that man was justified by faith only, has attracted more attention than perhaps any other in this field. After Grisar's discoveries that the essence of the doctrine was pure passivity, and that the supposed revelation came to him as late as 1519 and in a most unpleasant place, a fresh attempt to solve the problem was made by the application of the psycho-analytical theories of Sigismund Freud.¹⁷ An early, indeed infantile, experience of bodily hardship and spiritual terror implanted in the boy's mind a desperate impression of the power and danger of concupiscence, and it was this, working out under manifold modification of later study and ascetic experience, that brought him, through a sense of his own weakness, to throw himself entirely on the merits of the Saviour. The attempt, though in line with previous researches by Braun, Hausrath, Köhler, and others, who had noticed the neurotic elements in Luther's strong character, was criticized by Scheel

^{14a} Text *conterinam*, might be changed to *Catarinam*, meaning Braun's sister, but much more likely *conterminam*, 'neighbor,' referring to some lady Luther had known at Eisenach, perhaps to Ursula Cotta.

¹⁵ *Martinus viropolitanus arbiter tuus onerarius*. That *viropolitanus* means "from the town of Mansfeld" is quite certain, however meaningless the barbarous compound itself may be. The *arbiter tuus onerarius* was a jocose title given Luther by Braun, with allusion to Cicero, *Tusc.* v. 120, where Cicero says that in philosophical disputes on virtue and the good, Carneades would act *tanquam honorarius arbiter*.

¹⁶ That this letter is really to Braun is proved by the fact that the same title *divinus miles* is given to him in Letter 11.

¹⁷ Preserved Smith, 'Luther's Early Development in the Light of Psychoanalysis,' *American Journal of Psychology*, July, 1913; *Id.*, 'Luther's Development of the Doctrine of Justification by Faith Only,' *Harvard Theological Review*, October, 1913.

as derogatory to the Reformer's personality. Scheel not only idealizes Luther, but, as Köhler noticed in a review, makes him too normal; Scheel is always asking simply what the average student or friar would have experienced, and applying this to his subject. Thus he denies the value of some of Luther's own most explicit sayings, such as that he was forced to do the menial work of the cloister as a novice, and that he almost broke down through nervous terror when saying his first mass. But Scheel has no right to set aside testimony inconvenient to his thesis — as he does both in his large book and in a small selection of extracts from the Reformer's works, intended to illustrate the course of his development¹⁸ — and for this he has been severely and on the whole justly criticized by A. V. Müller.¹⁹ Müller accuses him not only of this tendency but of ignorance of "the Catholic psyche" and of medieval theology, in which field Müller's own reading is remarkably large.²⁰ His own thesis, doubtless carried too far, is that everything in Luther can be found in his predecessors, and that there is practically nothing original at all in the Reformer's thought. Ernst Troeltsch²¹ speaks of Luther's early days as an insoluble problem, full of nervous crises and melancholy.

The tendency, however, is now to emphasize the normality and cheerfulness of the boy's life as a student, and consequently to throw into stronger relief the suddenness of his vow to be a monk and the regret he felt for it afterwards.²² That it was influenced by the outbreak of plague in 1505 is denied by Scheel, but is again made probable by Neubauer. That he was ordained priest on April 3, 1507, is now considered likely.²³ Scheel denies the early influence of Staupitz, and Müller thinks that the spiritual director who helped him so much in the

¹⁸ O. Scheel, *Dokumente zu Luthers Entwicklung*, 1911.

¹⁹ A. V. Müller, *Luthers Werdegang bis zum Turmerlebnis*, 1920, and in *Theologische Studien und Kritiken*, 1917, pp. 496 ff.

²⁰ A. V. Müller, *Luthers theologische Quellen*, 1912.

²¹ 'Luther und der Protestantismus,' *Neue Rundschau*, xxviii (1917), p. 1312.

²² Scheel, i, 259; Neubauer, p. 99; Freitag in *Historische Zeitschrift*, cxix, 270 ff.; Biereye, pp. 180 ff.

²³ *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, xxxvii (1917), p. 216; Scheel, 'Luthers Primiz,' in *Studien G. Kauer*, 1917, pp. 1 ff.

cloister was Usingen.²⁴ The importance of the doctorate has attracted the attention of Steinlein.²⁵

The exact course of Luther's development during these cloister years has been traced by a large number of scholars, and agreement on it seems far from reached. The date of the "conversion" has been put by Böhmer in 1505, by Scheel in the winter of 1512-13, by Müller in 1514, and by Grisar in 1519. My own opinion that it came when Luther had begun to lecture on Romans, in the late spring or early summer of 1515, has been confirmed by the subsequent researches of Bonwetsch.²⁶ Particularly thorough studies have been made of the influence of the mystics on the Reformer.²⁷

A new source of considerable importance for these years is the publication, for the first time, of Luther's earliest lectures on Galatians, given from October 27, 1516, to April 24, 1517.²⁸ While they contain no such treasures as the lectures on Romans, they offer many a welcome addition to our previous knowledge. For one thing they show the Erasmian influence at its maximum, not only by the many quotations from the editor of the Greek Testament, but by the preference of the author for Jerome against Augustine (pp. 18, 39). This is particularly interesting, as Humbert has derived the alienation of Erasmus

²⁴ Werdegang, p. 15.

²⁵ H. Steinlein, *Luthers Doktorat*, 1912. Cf. Enders, xvii, 86 f.; *Luther's Correspondence*, i, no. 4.

²⁶ *Harvard Theological Review*, 1913, p. 420, note; Scheel, ii, 318 ff.; Müller, *Werdegang*, 130; Cf. *Tischreden*, Weimar, iii, no. 3232; *Luthers Werke*, Weimar, xxxv, 86. Cf. also O. Ritschl, 'Luthers seelische Kämpfe in seiner früheren Mönchtum,' *Internationale Wochenschrift*, January 21, 1911; F. Loofs, 'Justitia dei passiva in Luthers Anfängen,' *Theologische Studien und Kritiken*, 1911, pp. 461-473; A. Humbert, *Les origines de la théologie moderne*, 1911; W. Köhler, 'Luther bis 1521,' *Im Morgenrot der Reformation*, ed. Pflugk-Harttung, 1912; E. Billing, *1517-1521: ett bidrag till frågan om Luthers religiösa och teologiska utvecklingsgång*, 1917; H. von Schubert, *Luthers Frühentwicklung bis 1517-19*, 1916; G. N. Bonwetsch, *Wie wurde Luther zum Reformator?*, 1917.

²⁷ A. V. Müller, *Luther und Tauler*, 1918; *Die Predigten Taulers*, hrsg. von F. Vetter, 1910; *Der Frankfurter (deutsche theologia)*, hrsg. von W. Uhl (*Kleine Texte*, no. 96); Hunziger, 'Luther und die deutsche Mystik,' *Neue Kirchliche Zeitschrift*, xix, 972-988; G. Siedel, *Die Mystik Taulers*, 1911; M. Windstosser, *Étude sur la 'Théologie germanique'*, 1912.

²⁸ *Luthers Vorlesung über den Galaterbrief 1516-17*, hrsg. von Hans von Schubert, 1918. On this, further, J. Ficker, *Luther, 1517, 1918*.

and Luther from the preference of the humanist for Jerome and of the friar for Augustine.²⁹ These lectures also show that Luther had fully arrived at his doctrine of justification by faith only, and that he was still exercised by the distinction between the law and the gospel which he later described as the crux of his early theology. The best commentary on Luther's early exegesis of Scripture is not found in the recent Protestant work of Schlatter,³⁰ or in the Catholic essay of Lagrange,³¹ but in a brilliant little book by Meissinger,³² pointing out the exact limitations as well as the strength of the Wittenberg professor. More light may be expected from the publication of the commentary on Hebrews, now in preparation. Extracts from it may be found in Grisar's first volume.

The journey to Rome has been carefully studied by Böhmer,³³ by whom the exact condition of the city at the time is well set forth. In this respect much may also be gathered from the sumptuous work of Rodocanachi.³⁴ The discovery by Kawerau of some notes of the Augustinian General, Aegidius Viterbo, has definitely settled the time of the trip as in the winter of 1510-1511.³⁵ That Luther was sent as a delegate of the convents protesting against Staupitz's attempt to force them all into the "Observants," and that while at Rome he changed sides and went over to Staupitz, thus making his transfer from Erfurt to Wittenberg necessary soon after his return, as asserted by Grisar, is probable, though it has been denied by Scheel. A new light on the famous story of the ascent of the Scala Santa interrupted by the thought, "Who knows whether the prayer said here avails?" has come from a sermon of 1545 recently discovered.³⁶ According to this Luther was performing the act in order to get the soul of a forbear out of purgatory, and

²⁹ Humbert, *op. cit.*, chap. 5: St. Jérôme contre St. Augustine.

³⁰ A. Schlatter, *Luthers Deutung des Römerbriefes*, 1917.

³¹ M. J. Lagrange, *Luther on the Eve of his Revolt*, translated by W. S. Reilly, 1918 (originally written 1914-16, on Luther's Commentary on Romans).

³² K. A. Meissinger, *Luthers Exegese in der Frühzeit*, 1911.

³³ H. Böhmer, *Luthers Romfahrt*, 1914.

³⁴ E. Rodocanachi, *Rome au Temps de Jules II et de Léon X*, 1912. Cf. what Luther says of seeing the Barigel at Rome (*Werke*, Berlin, viii, 134) with Rodocanachi, p. 276.

³⁵ *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, xxxii, 604.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, 607.

stopped because of doubt. Since then a plate has been found at Delft with a picture of the Scala Santa and the legend, "Who knows whether this is genuine?"³⁷ showing possibly that Luther's doubts were occasioned rather by suspicion of the genuineness of the relic than by the dawning thought of justification by faith. One of the most interesting new discoveries is that by Grisar that on his return journey, in order to avoid the wars in North Italy, Luther returned through France, saying mass at Nice probably on January 20, 1511, thence through Pernes near Avignon, where he was the guest of the Augustinian cloister, and then up the Rhone Valley and through Switzerland.³⁸

II. THE BEGINNING OF THE REFORMATION, 1517-1521

A general review of this period is offered in convenient form in two works by Professor Dau.³⁹ On the theory and practice of indulgences something may be found scattered here and there in recent works,⁴⁰ notably in a study of contemporary documents by Göller. New studies of the Ninety-five Theses have exhibited their logical order,⁴¹ have shown that they were printed by Luther himself before they were posted on the castle church,⁴² and have discussed their theological postulates.⁴³

³⁷ *Theologische Rundschau*, xv (1912), 88 f.; Grisar, iii, 958. A. Eckhof, 'Luther en de Pilatus-Trap te Rome,' *Nederlandsch Archief voor Kerkgeschiedenis*, N. S., xii, 1 ff., 1916.

³⁸ H. Grisar, 'Lutheranalekten,' *Historisches Jahrbuch*, xxxix (1919), 487 ff.

³⁹ W. H. T. Dau, *The Leipzig Debate*, 1919; Id., *The Great Renunciation*, 1920.

⁴⁰ E.g. in H. de Jongh, *L'ancienne Faculté de Théologie de Louvain*, 1911, pp. 92 ff.; C. W. Wallace, *Evolution of the English Drama up to Shakespeare*, 1912, p. 51, on an English play on indulgences in 1518; G. Guinness, *Peru*, 1908, p. 372, showing that in South America indulgences for the dead are still profitable; E. Göller, *Der Ausbruch der Reformation und die spätmittelalterliche Ablasspraxis*, 1917.

⁴¹ T. Brieger, 'Die Gliederung der 95 Thesen,' *Lenz-Festschrift*, 1910, pp. 1-37.

⁴² O. Clemen in *Luthers Werke*, Bonn, i, 1912, p. 1. They were probably printed at Wittenberg with types borrowed from Melchior Lotther of Leipzig, *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, xxxv, 164 f. A different conclusion is reached by O. Günther, 'Die Drucker von Luthers Ablassthesen 1517,' *Zeitschrift für Bücherfreunde*, N. F. ix, 259 ff., 1918. He thinks they were first printed by Jerome Hölzel of Nuremberg and John Thanner Herbipolensis of Leipzig.

⁴³ M. Rade, *Luthers Rechtfertigungsglaube und seine Bedeutung für die 95 Thesen und für uns*, 1917.

Paul Kalkoff, having mastered this period as has none other, has in many works illuminated the subject of the Roman process against Luther.⁴⁴ He shows that Cajetan's *Tractatus de Indulgentiis*, finished at Rome on December 8, 1517, was already directed against Luther, and that the same theologian drafted the bull *Cum postquam* condemning his position; he also shows that the influence of Miltitz has been recently exaggerated.

The influences that bore on Luther during these great years have also been carefully studied by Kalkoff, who would reduce to a minimum the part played by Hutten,⁴⁵ whom he thinks neither sincere nor able; and on the other hand would exalt the rôles of Elector Frederic⁴⁶ and of Erasmus. Professor D. S. Schaff's interesting study of "A Spurious Tract of John Huss" suggested to a Luther scholar the probability that the work was forged in the interest of the Reformer about 1521.⁴⁷ Recently a sixteenth-century manuscript containing Huss's Prophesy of Luther, has been discovered.⁴⁸

A fresh study of the Address to the German Nobility has discovered in it traces of the influence of Marsiglio of Padua and of Occam's politics.⁴⁹ New sources have been unearthed relating to the publication of the bull *Exsurge Domine* by Eck in Germany,⁵⁰ and to the battle against him waged by the

⁴⁴ P. Kalkoff, 'Forschungen zu Luthers römischen Prozess,' *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, xxxii (1911), pp. 1 ff., 199 ff., 408 ff., 572 ff.; xxxiii (1912), 1 ff. *Id.*, 'Die von Cajetan verfasste Ablassdekretale und seine Verhandlungen mit dem Kurfürsten von Sachsen in Weimar, 28 und 29 Mai, 1519,' *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte*, ix (1912), 142 ff.; *Id.*, *Die Miltiziade*, 1911. Cf. also H. Barge, 'Das Vorgehen der Kurie gegen Luther 1518-21,' *Neue Jahrbücher für das klassische Altertum*, xxvii (1911).

⁴⁵ On Hutten, cf. O. Harnack, 'Ulrich von Hutten,' in *Im Morgenrot der Reformation*, hrsg. von Pflugk-Harttung, 1912, pp. 451-554; P. Kalkoff, *Ulrich von Hutten und die Reformation*, 1920.

⁴⁶ P. Kalkoff, 'Friedrich der Weise,' *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte*, xiv (1917).

⁴⁷ Preserved Smith, 'Note to D. S. Schaff's Spurious Tract of John Huss,' *American Journal of Theology*, April, 1915. On Huss's influence on Luther, cf. *Werke*, Weimar, vol. I, p. 37.

⁴⁸ J. Truhlar, *Catalogus manu scriptorum Latinorum in Bibliotheca Universitatis Pragensis*, 1906, no. 2774, "Hussi de Luthero vaticinium."

⁴⁹ P. Imbart de la Tour, in *Revue de Métaphysique et de Morale*, 1918, p. 607. On the influence of Hutten and Capito, Kalkoff, *Hutten*, 1920, p. 74.

⁵⁰ J. Greving, 'Zur Verkündigung der Bulle Exsurge Domine,' in *Briefmappe*, i, 1912, pp. 196 ff. Bibliography of early printed editions of the bull in *Zeitschrift für Bücherfreunde*, N. F. ix, 197 ff., and x, 19, 1918-19.

University of Paris.⁵¹ The decisive importance of the burning of the Canon Law has been thus well stated by Workman: ⁵²

With his usual insight Luther saw that the overthrow of the ecclesiastical jurisprudence of the Middle Ages was a prime necessity if the Augustinian doctrine of grace was ever to receive its old place in the life of the church and the claims of the papacy to be overthrown. . . . In burning the Decretals Luther claimed more than his civil freedom; he asserted the need for a spiritual theology.

A flood of works ⁵³ on the Diet of Worms have laid bare the inner workings and the ecclesiastical-political log-rolling of that famous body. It now appears probable that Leo offered Frederic of Saxony his support in obtaining the imperial crown in return for the surrender of Luther, and it is certain that at the election of Charles, and in the capitulations drawn up by his agents at this time, Frederic stipulated that his subject should be heard, or at least should not be outlawed without a hearing. Thus were foiled Aleander's efforts to prevent Luther's appearance. Some discussion has been aroused by the assertion that Luther's promise to give an answer "without horns or teeth" referred to the student ceremony of "deposition" or hazing a freshman by pretending to extract his horrid horns and tusks.⁵⁴ Kalkoff has shown that the placard friendly to Luther, signed with the words "Buntschuch, Buntschuch, Buntschuch," was posted at Worms by Hermann van der Busche.⁵⁵ He has also demonstrated that the Edict of Worms was carried through the Diet by imperial pressure and intrigue, contrary to the

⁵¹ A. Clerval, *Régistres des procès-verbaux de la Faculté de Théologie de Paris*, i, 1917, pp. 273 f., 278 ff., 285; *Bulletin de l'histoire du Protestantisme français*, 1917, pp. 35 ff.

⁵² *Christian Thought to the Reformation*, 1911, p. 165.

⁵³ P. Kalkoff, *Das Wormser Edikt und die Erlasse des Reichsregiment und der einzelnen Reichsfürsten*, 1917; P. Kalkoff, *Luther und die Entscheidungsjahre der Reformation*, 1917; Kalkoff, *Die Entstehung des Wormser Edikts*, 1913; H. von Schubert, *Die Vorgeschichte der Berufung Luthers auf den Reichstag zu Worms*, 1912 (*Sitzungsberichte der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften, Phil.-hist. Klasse*, vi.); F. Boller, *Luthers Berufung nach Worms*, Giessen Dissertation, 1912. Documents in J. Kuhn, *Luther und der Wormser Reichstag*, 1913; Kalkoff, 'Zur Entstehung des Wormser Edikts,' *Archiv für Reformationgeschichte*, xiii (1916), pp. 241-276.

⁵⁴ H. Böhmer, *Luther im Lichte der neueren Forschung*, 4th ed., 1917, p. 147; W. Köhler, *Die deutsche Reformation und die Studenten*, 1917, p. 21; T. T. Neubauer, 'Luthers Frühzeit,' *Erfurter Jahrbücher*, N. F. xliii (1917), p. 47.

⁵⁵ *Archiv für Reformationgeschichte*, viii (1911), pp. 341 ff.

wishes of the majority, and that it was practically a dead letter even in the Catholic states of Germany.

III. THE GROWTH OF A PROTESTANT PARTY

No sooner had Luther, after his brave deed at Worms, gone to the seclusion of the Wartburg,⁵⁶ than the struggle with radicalism, scarcely less hard or less important for the history of his church than the battle with Romanism, began. The old sources having been edited with more care,⁵⁷ and some new ones having been added,⁵⁸ Barge has defended, while other scholars have impugned,⁵⁹ the thesis that the true line of development in the direction of lay religion and of real Protestantism was found by Carlstadt and the other radicals, and was from this time forth rather hindered than helped by the intervention of Luther. In regard to the Zwickau prophets it is interesting to note that the town had long been a hotbed of Waldensian heresy.⁶⁰ Luther's sermons against them have been declared by the most recent criticism⁶¹ to be unreliably handed down to us; on the other hand new sayings revealing his really frightful hatred for the radicals have come to light.⁶²

⁵⁶ Fine historical description of the Wartburg by O. Schmiedel, *Address of Welcome to the Wartburg*, August 12, 1910, reprinted in *Congress of Free Christianity*, 1911, p. 675. One of the noted sights there is the inkspot on the wall, or rather the hole where it was said to have been. Interesting to note that Fynes Moryson saw at Wittenberg in 1591, "an aspersion of ink cast by the Divell when he tempted Luther upon the wall of St. Augustine's college." F. Moryson's *Itinerary*, 1907, i, 16.

⁵⁷ H. Barge, *Aktenstücke zur Wittenberger Bewegung*, 1912; H. Lietzmann, *Karlstadt's Abtueung der Bilder und die Wittenberger Beutelordnung (Kleine Texte, no. 74)*.

⁵⁸ Accounts of the doings at Wittenberg 1522 by H. Mühlfort and J. Pfau, ed. by H. Böhmer, in *Neue kirchliche Zeitschrift*, xxv, 397 ff.

⁵⁹ H. Barge, 'Zur Genesis der Frühreformatoren Vorgänge in Wittenberg,' *Historische Vierteljahrschrift*, xxv (1914), and article 'Karlstadt' in *Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart*, iii; M. of Tiling, 'Der Kampf gegen die Missa privata,' *Neue kirchliche Zeitschrift*, xx.

⁶⁰ H. Böhmer, in *Schriften des Vereins für niedersächsische Geschichte und Altertumskunde*, xxxvi (1915), pp. 1-38.

⁶¹ O. Clemen, *Luthers Werke*, Bonn, ii, 1913, p. 311.

⁶² "If Carlstadt believes there is any God in heaven or earth, may Christ never be gracious to me," said Luther. *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte*, xi (1914), 141. On Luther's battle with James Schenck, see P. Vetter in *Neues Archiv für sächsische Geschichte*, xxx (1909), 76 ff.; xxxii (1911), 23 ff.

The same years that saw the struggle with radicalism saw the controversy with Henry VIII and the much more important break with humanism in the person of Erasmus. Two studies⁶³ of the former aim to probe the causes of the alternate enmity and rapprochement of the king and the Reformer and to exhibit the amazing number of opinions offered Henry by divines that bigamy would be a permissible solution of his matrimonial difficulties.

Well worn as is the attractive subject of the relations of Luther and Erasmus, new light may be expected, as it has to some extent been already shed, by the splendid edition of Erasmus's epistles by Mr. P. S. Allen.⁶⁴ Even if little new material on this subject has as yet been forthcoming, the proper arrangement of all the letters in order and with full notes is valuable. It is interesting, for example, to know that Erasmus sent the Ninety-five Theses to Colet and More, with favorable comment, on March 5, 1518,⁶⁵ and probably sent a greeting to Luther as early as January of that year.⁶⁶ Kalkoff has shown,⁶⁷ with success on the whole even though with some exaggeration, that Erasmus took a much more favorable view of Luther during his first years than he would himself later admit, and that he tried with great energy and even hardihood to secure him a fair hearing before an impartial court. Luther's completely Augustinian doctrine of the bondage of the will has been illuminated by A. V. Müller,⁶⁸ while a few new sources as to the pro-

⁶³ Preserved Smith, 'Luther and Henry VIII,' *English Historical Review*, 1910; *Id.*, 'German Opinion of the Divorce of Henry VIII,' *ibid.*, 1912. A note on the play against Luther given at the English Court by the children of St. Paul's School is found in C. W. Wallace, *Evolution of the English Drama*, 1912, pp. 66 ff.

⁶⁴ *Opus Epistolarum Erasmi*, iii, 1913, to June, 1519. Mr. Allen writes me that the fourth volume is now in press and the fifth and sixth ready in manuscript.

⁶⁵ Allen, Epp. 785, 786.

⁶⁶ Allen, Ep. 755, *saluta Eleutherium Audacem*. Allen does not make the identification with Luther, which, however, seems probable to me. "Eleutherius" was the form in which Luther then wrote his name and by which Erasmus first knew him.

⁶⁷ P. Kalkoff, *Erasmus, Luther, und Friedrich der Weise*, 1919.

⁶⁸ *Luthers theologischen Quellen*, 1912, pp. 209 f., and *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, xxv, 135 f. It seems that Luther's comparison of the will to a beast of burden is found in Raymund of Sabunde, and in Augustine, or perhaps Pseudo-Augustine, *Lib. iii Hypomnesticum*; see Seit, *Der authentische Text der Leipziger Disputation*, p. 28.

ress of the controversy have seen the light.⁶⁹ A scholarly, if somewhat diffuse, comparison of the Reformer and the humanist, has now come from the pen of Dr. R. H. Murray, of Dublin.⁷⁰

As the Lutheran church was losing the radicals and the humanists, it sustained another shock in the sacramentarian schism, begun indeed by Carlstadt, but carried to its most important lengths by Zwingli and Oecolampadius. New light on the course of the controversy has shone from the pages of the latest edition of Zwingli's works, now in course of publication though much delayed on account of the war,⁷¹ and from several special studies based in large part on this,⁷² and by a few new sources;⁷³ to which will presently be added Bullinger's correspondence, now in preparation for printing. The influence of Carlstadt and Hoen on Zwingli is now clear, as is his somewhat disingenuous tactic in spreading his views by means of an open letter nominally addressed to a Lutheran pastor, Matthew Alber, but in reality not sent to him or to anyone who could forward it to Wittenberg. Hans von Schubert⁷⁴ has shown, in a thorough and original work, that the basis of the discussion at Marburg was the symbol known as the Schwabach Articles, drawn up not, as hitherto believed, after, but in reality before, the meeting took place. The unhappy effects of the schism long after Zwingli's death were noted by his followers in Italy⁷⁵ and in Switzerland.⁷⁶

⁶⁹ Letters of M. Förster, in *Theologische Studien und Kritiken*, 1911, 1 ff.

⁷⁰ *Luther and Erasmus: their Attitude towards Toleration*, 1920.

⁷¹ *Zwingli's Werke*, hrsg. von E. Egli, G. Finsler, und W. Köhler, 1905 ff. Volumes 1, 2, 3, 7, 8 and parts of 4 and 9. The treatises now come to 1525, the correspondence to 1528. An English translation of *The Latin Works and Correspondence of H. Zwingli*, ed. S. M. Jackson, has begun. Vol. i, 1912.

⁷² W. Köhler, 'Zum Abendmahlsstreite zwischen Luther und Zwingli,' *Lutherstudien zur 4. Jahrhundertfeier der Reformation*, 1917, pp. 114 ff.; J. A. Faulkner, 'Dies ist mein Leib: a Celebrated Debate,' *Baptist Theological Quarterly*, 1915, pp. 397 ff.

⁷³ Daniel Greser's Autobiography, in *Zwingliana*, ii (1920), 324; and W. Köhler: *ibid.*, pp. 356 ff., on the Marburg Conference.

⁷⁴ *Bündnis und Bekenntnis 1529-30*, 1910.

⁷⁵ Letter of Venetian Protestants to Luther, November 26, 1542; Enders, xv, 26.

⁷⁶ Bullinger to Vadian, May, 1544; *Vadianische Briefsammlung*, ed. Arbenz und Wartmann, vi (1908), p. 321.

Perhaps this is the most convenient place to recall briefly the new sources and treatment of Luther's relations with Duke George of Saxony.⁷⁷

IV. CHURCH BUILDING

None of the numerous recent studies of Luther's Bible are quite so interesting as the protocol of the revisions of 1531 and 1539-41 now first published in the Weimar edition.⁷⁸ The immense care, the linguistic genius, and the practical interest of Luther stand out here as never before. Thus, during the sessions of the committee of revision, Luther is reported as saying: "I will sing Psalm 64 as a farewell to the papists and hope they will howl Amen to it" (p. 28); and again, on Genesis 1, "Aristotle says much of this chapter but proves little" (p. 169), and of Genesis 3, "No fable could be more fabulous" (p. 172). Errors are freely admitted in the sacred writings, as in the contradiction between Genesis 12 and Acts 7, 2 ff., or in the exaggerated numbers in 1 Kings 5, 15. Reichert has added to this an account of two new protocols of the revision of the New Testament,⁷⁹ and the first edition of the German Testament (September, 1522) has been accurately reproduced by the Furche-Verlag in Berlin, with good introductions by G. Kawerau and O. Reichert.

Various studies of the relation of Luther's translation to its predecessors have shown that it borrowed little;⁸⁰ and its immediate success in driving out all other versions, except to

⁷⁷ F. Gess, *Akten und Briefe zur Kirchenpolitik Herzog Georgs von Sachsen*. Band ii, 1524-27, 1917; O. A. Hecker, *Religion und Politik in den letzten Lebensjahren Herzog Georgs des Bärtigen von Sachsen*, 1912. *Bibliographie der sächsischen Geschichte*, hrsg. von R. Bemmman, i, 1918.

⁷⁸ *Luthers Werke*, Weimar, *Deutsche Bibel*, iii. Vol. v has also been published. Cf. also, Risch, 'Welche Aufgabe stellt die Lutherbibel der wissenschaftlichen Forschung?' *Neue kirchliche Zeitschrift*, 1911.

⁷⁹ O. Reichert, 'Zwei neue Protokolle zur Revision des Neuen Testaments,' *Luthersstudien zur 4. Jahrhundertfeier der Reformation*, 1917, pp. 203 ff.

⁸⁰ W. W. Florer, *Luthers Use of the Pre-Lutheran Versions of the Bible*, 1913, maintains that he did; but on the other hand, see M. Burgdorf, *Johann Lange*. Rostock Dissertation, 1911, pp. 79 ff.; W. Walther, *Die ersten Konkurrenten des Bibelübersetzers Luther*, 1917; W. Walther, *Luthers Deutsche Bibel*, 1917; Weber, 'Zu Luthers September und December-Testament,' *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, xxxiii, 399.

some small extent the Swiss one by Leo Jud, has been demonstrated by Zerener.⁸¹ Other studies on the linguistic side aim to show that Luther had practically completed his version, in small bits, before he went to the Wartburg.⁸² It has now been proved by Reichert that the Bible of 1546 represents Luther's final revision, and not, as previously thought, the changes made by Rörer on his own initiative.⁸³

The problem of church government facing Luther has been best stated, perhaps, among recent contributions, by E. Förster,⁸⁴ and best answered by Professor Macmillan.⁸⁵ Of the two alternatives open to him, that of congregationalism and that of state rule, he would have preferred the former, but was driven by force of circumstances, particularly by the unruly radicals, to embrace the latter. New sources and fresh analyses of his order of divine service,⁸⁶ of his system of church visitation,⁸⁷ and of his political theory⁸⁸ have come forth. A new note is the attention now paid to economic questions and the capitalistic revolution of the sixteenth century.⁸⁹ Old, on the other hand, is the problem of Luther and toleration, now again

⁸¹ H. Zerener, *Studien über das beginnende Eindringen der lutherischen Bibelübersetzung in die deutsche Literatur*, 1911.

⁸² W. W. Florer, in *Publications of the Modern Language Association*, xxvi, 1911, and in a paper read at Modern Language Association, 1915; E. Giese, *Untersuchungen über das Verhältnis von Luthers Sprache zur Wittenberger Drucksprache*, 1915.

⁸³ *Lutherstudien*, u. s. w., 1917, p. 221; *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte*, xiv (1917), p. 227. On the subsequent life of the book, see J. P. Hentz, *History of the Lutheran Version of the Bible*, 1910, and H. Guthe, *Luther und die Bibelforschung der Gegenwart*, 1917.

⁸⁴ In *Fifth International Congress of Free Christianity*, English, 1911, p. 225.

⁸⁵ K. D. Macmillan, *Protestantism in Germany*, 1917.

⁸⁶ P. Drews, *Studien zur Geschichte des Gottesdienstes und des gottesdienstlichen Lebens*, iv und v, 1910; K. Holl, 'Die Entstehung von Luthers Kirchenbegriff,' *Forschungen und Versuche zur Geschichte*. Festschrift Dietrich Schäfer dargebracht, 1915, pp. 410 ff.

⁸⁷ Berbig, 'Akten der Kursächsischen Visitationen,' *Deutsche Zeitschrift für Kirchenrecht*, xxi (1912), pp. 386-429.

⁸⁸ K. Holl, 'Luther und die landesherrliche Kirchenregiment,' *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche*. Ergänzungsheft, 1911; E. Troeltsch, *Die Soziallehren der christlichen Kirchen und Gruppen*, 1912.

⁸⁹ J. A. Faulkner, 'Luther and Economic Questions,' *Papers of the American Society of Church History*, 2d series, ii, 1910; J. Schliter, 'Luther's Kampf gegen den Kapitalismus,' *Neue Kirchliche Zeitschrift*, 1917, pp. 126 ff.; A. Hilpert, *Die Sequestration der geistlichen Güter in Kursachsen, 1531-43*. Leipzig Dissertation, 1911.

approached with greater acumen and depth than ever.⁹⁰ It is clearer than ever that Luther was tolerant in his early years, but that with the triumph of his church, and under the pressure of men more impatient of dissent than himself, he came to justify persecution on the plea that he was putting down, not freedom of belief, but open blasphemy. It is also clear that, however much the Reformation may have temporarily overclouded the European sky with dark fanaticism, it eventually worked out the academic freedom of the Renaissance into a far broader religious liberty for the peoples as a whole.

Passing over, as not particularly important, what has recently been done on Luther's preaching,⁹¹ teaching,⁹² and hymns,⁹³ a word must be said as to the catechisms.⁹⁴ A source for the first part of the catechisms has now been found in a book on the Ten Commandments printed at Strassburg in 1516. Since that same year, at least, Luther had regularly preached on them; three cycles of sermons of the year 1528 furnishing him with the well-worked material digested into the Small and Large Catechisms. These were prepared together, the Small Catechism coming out in tabular form in January, 1529, and in book form in May, and the Large Catechism in

⁹⁰ N. Paulus, *Protestantismus und Toleranz*, 1911; K. Völker, *Toleranz und Intoleranz im Zeitalter der Reformation*, 1912; F. Ruffini, *Religious Liberty*, 1912; R. Lewin, *Luthers Stellung zu den Juden*, 1911; P. Wappler, *Die Stellung Kursachsens und Philipps von Hessen zur Taufbewegung*, 1910; G. L. Burr: 'Anent the Middle Ages,' *American Historical Review*, 1913, 710-726; K. Sell, 'Der Zusammenhang von Reformation und politischen Freiheit,' *Abhandlungen und Theologischen Arbeiten aus dem rheinischen wissenschaftlichen Predigerverein*, N. F. xii, 1910; J. A. Faulkner, 'Luther and Toleration,' *Papers of the American Society of Church History*, 2d Series, iv (1914), pp. 129 ff.; Preserved Smith, *Life and Letters of Luther*, 2d ed., Preface, 1914.

⁹¹ L. Ihmels, *Das Dogma in der Predigt Luthers*, 1912; J. A. Singmaster, 'Luther the Preacher,' *Lutheran Quarterly*, July, 1917.

⁹² W. Friedensburg, *Geschichte der Universität Wittenberg*, 1917; W. Köhler, *Die Reformation und die Studenten*, 1917.

⁹³ J. F. Lauchert, *Luther's Hymns*, 1917; O. Albrecht, 'Das Lutherlied, Was fürchtest du Feind Herodes?' *Theologische Studien und Kritiken*, 1912, pp. 287 ff.; O. Brenner, 'Und keinen Dank dazu haben,' *Lutherstudien*, 1917, pp. 72 ff.; Böhmer (*Luther im Lichte der neueren Forschung*, 4th ed., p. 145) now asserts that Luther composed the music to *Ein feste Burg*. Grisar (iii, 290), dates this hymn in 1528, calling attention to the striking parallels in the Sermons on John (*Werke*, Weimar, xxviii).

⁹⁴ J. Adam, in *Evangelische Freiheit*, xii, 5; O. Albrecht, *Luthers Katechismen*, 1915.

April. As early as 1528 Melanchthon speaks ⁹⁵ of a schoolbook, or primer, containing the alphabet, creed, Lord's Prayer, and other prayers. Luther's catechism was soon used in the same way; an example of an edition apparently unknown to the Weimar editors is in the library of Mr. G. A. Plimpton of New York.⁹⁶

Among the newer works on Luther's theology may be mentioned those of McGiffert, Gottschick, Seeberg, and Tschackert, and the slighter essays of Faulkner, Baranowski, Preuss, Pohlmann, Lagrange, and Stange.⁹⁷

V. LAST YEARS

Luther's private life continues to attract attention, especially as our chief source for knowing it, the wonderful Table Talk, is now coming out in the Weimar edition in fuller and better form than ever.⁹⁸ Various studies ⁹⁹ of the reliability of

⁹⁵ *Luthers Werke*, Weimar, xxvi, 237.

⁹⁶ *Parvus catechismus pro pueris in Schola nuper auctus*. . . . *Ad ludum literarium Autor: Parve puer, parvum tu ne contemne libellum, Continet hic summi Dogmata summa Dei*. Follows a woodcut of the crucifix. There is no date. It begins with letters, vowels, diphthongs and consonants in Latin. There is a picture illustrating each Commandment, one showing baptism by immersion and one showing the wafer put into the communicant's mouth. Mr. Plimpton also has a *Deutsch Catechismus Mar. Luther. Gedruckt zu Nürnberg durch Friederichen Peypus aus verlegung des Ersamen mans Leonard zu der Aych Büchführer zu Nürnberg*. MDXXIX. Mr. Plimpton also possesses, *Parvus catechismus pro pueris in schola nuper auctus per Marti. Luth. Witebergae*. 1543. Preface by John Sauromannus to Hermann Crotus Rubeanus, dated September 29.

⁹⁷ A. C. McGiffert, *Protestant Thought before Kant*, 1911; J. Gottschick, *Luthers Theologie*, 1914; Tschackert, *Die Entstehung der lutherischen und der Reformierten Kirchenlehre*, 1910; J. A. Faulkner, 'Luther and the Divinity of Christ,' *Methodist Review*, 1913, pp. 373 ff.; R. Seeberg, *Luthers Lehre*, (*Dogmengeschichte*, vol. 4), 1917; L. Ihmels, *Das Christentum Luthers in seiner Eigenart*, 1917; H. Preuss, *Luthers Frömmigkeit*, 1917; Pohlmann, *Die Grenze für die Bedeutung des religiösen Erlebnisses bei Luther*, 1920; J. M. Lagrange, *The Meaning of Christianity according to Luther and his Followers in Germany*, 1920; C. Stange, *Luther und das sittliche Ideal*, 1919.

⁹⁸ *Luthers Tischreden*, Weimar, 4 vols. 1912 ff.

⁹⁹ Kroker, in *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte*, viii (1911), pp. 160 ff.; and in *Jahrbuch des Luther-Vereins zu Wittenberg*, i, 1919; A. Wahl, 'Beiträge zur Kritik der Überlieferung von Luthers Tischgesprächen der Frühzeit,' *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte*, xvii (1920), pp. 11 ff.; F. Cohrs, in *Lutherstudien zur 4. Jahrhundertfeier*, 1917, pp. 159 ff.; L. Christiani, 'Les Propos de Table de Luther,' *Revue des Questions Historiques*, 1911, pp. 470 ff.; 1912, pp. 101 ff., 436 ff.

this record agree that it is of inferior value to the written works, but nevertheless of considerable worth. An English translation of selections, practically all based on the new editions, has been published in Boston.¹⁰⁰

The treasures of the Luther house, now a museum, at Wittenberg, have been catalogued by J. von Pflugk-Harttung.¹⁰¹ Various short articles deal with the Reformer's life within that house and with his family.¹⁰² The old story that Catharine von Bora came to Amsdorf and offered to marry either him or Martin Luther has been traced to its source in an ungallant passage from the memoirs of Amsdorf, who added, untruly, that she was avaricious and took poor care of her husband.¹⁰³ It may interest Americans to know that the Reformer's wedding ring, or betrothal ring, has been brought to America by its owner, a German baroness born, now Mrs. Maximilian Pinkert.¹⁰⁴ A novel by J. Knudsen, translated into German by Mathilde Mann under the title *Angst*, turns on Luther's supposed love for a niece of Frau Cotta. A photo-play showed at Berlin in 1914 made Catharine von Bora follow her hero to the Diet of Worms.¹⁰⁵

A study of Luther's Early Portraits that appeared in *Scribner's Magazine*¹⁰⁶ traced to their origins several contemporary woodcuts, one of which, now in the London Record Office, was apparently sent to Henry VIII by his ambassador in Germany. Much fuller works¹⁰⁷ exhibit the early authentic likenesses of the man and the subsequently changing ideal of the Reformer

¹⁰⁰ *Conversations with Luther*, transl. and ed. by Preserved Smith and H. P. Gallinger, 1915.

¹⁰¹ 'Aus dem Lutherhause zu Wittenberg,' *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, xxx; E. Kroker, in *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte*, xvii (1920), 280 ff. On the looting of this museum by robbers recently, see the *New York Times*, January 4, 1919.

¹⁰² Preserved Smith, 'The Personal Side of Luther,' *Homiletic Review*, October, 1917.

¹⁰³ E. Kroker, 'Luthers Werbung von Katharina von Bora,' *Lutherstudien*, 1917, pp. 140 ff.

¹⁰⁴ *New York Times*, January 24, 1916. The ring was for some time on exhibition at the New York Historical Society.

¹⁰⁵ On this, H. von Schubert, *Luthers Frühentwicklung*, 1916, p. 7. The plot of *Angst* must resemble that of Mrs. Charles's *Schönberg-Cotta Family*.

¹⁰⁶ July, 1913, by Preserved Smith.

¹⁰⁷ H. Preuss, *Lutherbildnisse historisch-kultisch gesichtet und erläutert*, 1914; J. Ficker, *Die ältesten Bildnisse Luthers*, 1920.

throughout the centuries, to all of which he appeared in a different character, as the Man of God, the Prophet, the Pietist, the Rationalist, the Liberal, the Patriot, the Personality. It may be worth noting here that paintings of Luther and his wife were made, probably after Cranach, by Lorenzo Lotto in Venice in 1540.¹⁰⁸ Are these the ones now in the Milan Gallery? Other likenesses now and then turn up.¹⁰⁹ The death-mask is now known to be spurious.¹¹⁰

Various studies of several aspects of Luther's declining years have thrown into relief his relations with Philip of Hesse,¹¹¹ with Schwenckfeld,¹¹² and with Calvin.¹¹³ Three new accounts¹¹⁴ of his death have been discovered in America, the first, believed by Spaeth to be by John Albrecht, clerk of Mansfeld, has been criticized by Strieder in Germany; that published by Burr is a worthless account by an unknown writer; the third is a letter from Caspar Hedio to Count Philip of Hanau, dated March 16 and 19, 1546. A new form of the Catholic legend of Luther's death, to the effect that the devil carried him away as he was blaspheming the Virgin, has been discovered in France.¹¹⁵

¹⁰⁸ *Le Gallerie Nazionali Italiane*. I. Roma. 1884, p. 123, "Libro dei conti di Lorenzo Lotto," entry in Lotto's hand: "1540, 17 ott. A Mario d'Armano, suo nipote, doi quadretti del retratto de Martin Luter et sua moier per donarli al Tristan." On the portrait of Luther seen by Bembo at Mantua in 1537, see V. Cian, in *Giornale Storico della Letteratura Italiana*, ix (1887), p. 131.

¹⁰⁹ See *Zeitschrift für Bücherfreunde*, N. F. iv, 221 ff., 1913, and ix, 173 ff., 1918.

¹¹⁰ Böhmer, *Luther im Lichte der neueren Forschung*, 5th ed., 1918, p. 297.

¹¹¹ J. A. Faulkner, 'Luther and the Bigamous Marriage of Philip of Hesse,' *American Journal of Theology*, 1913, pp. 206 ff.

¹¹² *Corpus Schwenckfeldianorum*, ed Hartranft, vols. ii to iv, 1911 ff.; K. Eecke, *Schwenckfeld, Luther, und der Gedanke einer apostolischen Reformation*, 1911.

¹¹³ Nösgen in *Neue Kirchliche Zeitschrift*, xxii (1911), 7 ff.; E. Doumergue, *Jean Calvin*, ii, 562 ff.

¹¹⁴ G. L. Burr, 'A new Fragment on Luther's death,' *American Historical Review*, xvi (1911), 1 ff.; A. Spaeth, in *Lutheran Church Review*, xxix (1910), 313 ff. On this, denying its value, see J. Strieder, in *Historische Vierteljahrsschrift*, xv (1912), 379 ff.; and *Theologische Studien und Kritiken*, 1913, pp. 314 ff.; J. Strieder, *Authentische Berichte über Luthers letzte Lebensstunden* (Kleine Texte, no. 99); J. Heederschee, 'Luther's Laatste Levensdagen,' *Theologisch Tijdschrift*, li (1917), 5 ff.; C. Schubart, *Berichte über Luthers Tod und Begräbnis*, 1917; Preserved Smith, 'Some Old Unpublished Letters,' *Harvard Theological Review*, 1919, pp. 204 ff. Two letters on the subject were published by G. Kawerau in *Theologische Studien und Kritiken*, 1913, pp. 134 ff.

¹¹⁵ *Les Regretz et Complaintes de Passe partout et Bruict qui court*. . . Par Fr. Picart, 1557; quoted by H. Hauser, *Études sur la Réforme française*, 1909, p. 273.

VI. WORKS, DOCUMENTS, BIBLIOGRAPHIES

The great Weimar edition of Luther's works is now, with sixty volumes, nearing completion.¹¹⁶ A number of German editions of selections and translations from the works have come out recently, the most important for scholars being that in five volumes by O. Clemen.¹¹⁷ Two volumes of an excellent English translation are due to the labors of American Lutherans; let us hope that the other eight volumes will follow as planned.¹¹⁸ A convenient list of the Reformer's works, complete, and with references to the best edition, has come from the pen of Professor Gustav Kawerau.¹¹⁹

Eleven volumes of Luther's letters were published by Enders before his death in July, 1907. The work was then taken up by Professor Gustav Kawerau, who brought out the next five volumes, and had almost completed reading the proof of the seventeenth when he died, December 1, 1918. Professor Paul Flemming completed the printing of the seventeenth volume, containing the letters of the year 1546 and supplements to the year 1536;¹²⁰ he writes me that another volume of supplements may be expected. An English version¹²¹ of copious selections from Luther's correspondence and of contemporary letters bearing on his career, furnishes also some new material and aims to correct Enders in the light of recent research. Numer-

¹¹⁶ *Luthers Werke, Kritische Gesamtausgabe*, u. s. w., Weimar, 1883 ff. On this, O. Albrecht in *Lutherstudien*, 1917, pp. 29 ff.; the same volume contains much else on Luther's manuscripts, and on their first printing.

¹¹⁷ *Luthers Werke in Auswahl*, hrsg. von O. Clemen, 1912 ff.

¹¹⁸ *Works of Martin Luther*. Philadelphia, Holman. 2 vols., 1915, 1916 (translations by C. M. Jacobs, W. A. Lambert, J. J. Schindel, A. T. W. Steinhäuser, and A. L. Steimle).

¹¹⁹ Kawerau, *Luthers Schriften nach der Reihenfolge der Jahren verzeichnet*, 1917.

¹²⁰ *Dr. Martin Luthers Briefwechsel*, bearbeitet von E. L. Enders, fortgesetzt von G. Kawerau, weitergeführt von P. Flemming. Vol. 17. 1920. Professor Flemming has most kindly sent me the proofs of part of volume 18, publication of which is delayed. Professor Kawerau's death was a personal sorrow to me, as I shall never forget the extraordinary kindness he showed to me, an utter stranger, during my student years in Berlin.

¹²¹ *Luther's Correspondence and other Contemporary Letters*, translated and edited by Preserved Smith. Vol. i, 1913. Vol. ii, in collaboration with C. M. Jacobs, 1918.

ous supplements to the letters may be found scattered throughout German magazines; and various studies of the subject should not pass without notice.¹²² Among collections of pertinent documents that by Kidd¹²³ should be remembered, and among paleographical studies those by Clemen and Mentz.¹²⁴

At the head of recently published bibliographies stand the comprehensive work of Gustav Wolf,¹²⁵ and the eighth edition of Dahlmann-Waitz.¹²⁶ A less pretentious but well selected bibliography has been published in English by Kieffer, Rockwell, and Pannkoke.¹²⁷ New editions of Böhmer's *Luther im Lichte der neueren Forschung*,¹²⁸ now translated into English, are as readable as ever but no more reliable than before. Thoroughly trustworthy estimates of recent research in this field may be found in the works of Reu¹²⁹ and of Köhler.¹³⁰ *The Lutheran Quarterly* has printed a complete list of English translations of Luther's works, numbering an even hundred titles.¹³¹

Of the many new biographies of Luther called forth by the quadricentenary or its approach, only the scientifically noteworthy can here be reviewed. By far the most important is

¹²² T. Lockemann, *Technische Studien zu Luthers Briefen an Friedrich den Weisen*, 1913; P. Flemming, 'Die Lutherbriefe in der Rörersammlung,' in *Studien G. Kawerau dargebracht*, 1917, pp. 21 ff.; G. Kawerau, 'Die Bemühungen im 16, 17, und 18 Jahrhundert, Luthers Briefe zu sammeln und herauszugeben,' in *Lutherstudien*, 1917, 1 ff.

¹²³ B. J. Kidd, *Documents of the Continental Reformation*, 1911.

¹²⁴ G. Mentz, *Handschriften aus der Reformationszeit*, 1912; O. Clemen, *Handschriftenproben aus der Reformationszeit*, 1911.

¹²⁵ *Quellenkunde der deutschen Reformation*, 2 vols., 1915, 1916; on Luther, ii, 167 ff. To this should be added A. Herte's dissertation, *Die Lutherbiographie des J. Cochlaeus*, 1915, and the bibliography in Preserved Smith, *Age of the Reformation*, 1920.

¹²⁶ *Quellenkunde der deutschen Geschichte*, 8th ed., 1912. Cf. also *Bibliographie der sächsischen Geschichte*, hrsg. von R. Bemann, i, 1918.

¹²⁷ *List of References on the History of the Reformation in Germany*, by G. L. Kieffer, W. W. Rockwell, and O. H. Pannkoke, 1917.

¹²⁸ Fourth edition 1917, fifth 1918; English translation from third edition, 1916.

¹²⁹ J. M. Reu, *Thirty-five Years of Luther Research*, 1917.

¹³⁰ 'Der gegenwärtige Stand der Lutherforschung,' *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, xxxvii (1918), pp. 1-60.

¹³¹ Preserved Smith, 'Complete List of Works of Luther in English,' *Lutheran Quarterly*, October, 1918. Cf. also F. Wiener, *Naogeorgus in English*, 1913.

the immense effort represented in Hartmann Grisar's 2500 lexicon-octavo pages, three stout volumes in the German now turned into six English ones.¹³² Disclaiming the intention of writing an "artistic biography," with which he thinks the market drugged, he purposes to judge Luther solely as a religious phenomenon. Thus he is enabled to pass lightly over such things as are well known or favorable to the Reformer, and to dwell at immense length on whatever makes for his hostile, albeit courteously expressed and temperate, verdict. The most original and permanently valuable portion of the work is the study of the early years, showing how the Reformer's life reacted on the development of his doctrine. It was his quarrel with the Observant friars that gave him his first idea of the worthlessness of good works; it was his own hopeless struggle against concupiscence that convinced him of man's impotence of will. Grisar's further criticisms of Luther's character and influence are in part justified; but had he been in really genial relations with his subject he would never have thought that what he objected to much mattered. But if the book be judged not by its bias or by the merits of the question, but by what can be learned from it, Grisar's immense erudition will give it high rank.

Other biographies, mostly of the popular sort, must be mentioned for special qualities—Elsie Singmaster's for its charming style;¹³³ Schubert's new edition of Hausrath for its combined brilliancy and insight;¹³⁴ the work of Schreckenbach and Neubert¹³⁵ for its astounding wealth of instructive illustration; those of Harnack, Lenz, and Köhler¹³⁶ for their thorough re-

¹³² H. Grisar, *Luther*, 3 vols. 1911, 1912; English translation by E. M. Lamond, 6 vols., 1913 ff. Among the many reviews of this work or replies to it, the most important Protestant criticism is G. Kawerau, *Luther in katholischer Beleuchtung*, 1911.

¹³³ E. Singmaster (Mrs. E. S. Lewis), *Life of Martin Luther*, 1917.

¹³⁴ A. Hausrath, *Luthers Leben*. Neue Auflage von H. von Schubert, 1914. Hausrath occasionally makes rash and unsupported statements, some of which were taken over from the first edition by A. C. McGiffert in his life of Luther, 1911.

¹³⁵ *Martin Luther. Mit 384 Bildungen*, von P. Schreckenbach und F. Neubert, 1916.

¹³⁶ A. von Harnack, *M. Luther und die Begründung der Reformation*, 1917; W. Köhler, *M. Luther und die deutsche Reformation*, 1916; Id., *M. Luther der deutsche Reformator*, 1917; M. Lenz, *Luther und der deutsche Geist*, 1917. Cf. also Etzin, *M. Luther, sein Leben und sein Werk*, 1917; P. Severinsen, *M. Luthers Liv*, 1911.

liability and skilful compression; that of Christiani¹³⁷ for its worthlessness. The new volume of A. Berger's *M. Luther in kulturgeschichtlicher Darstellung*¹³⁸ is notable for its careful analysis of the Reformer's influence on contemporary and subsequent art, literature, music, and philosophy. He reckons Luther's career as the first revelation of German inwardness in its world-transforming might, and he calls his discovery that the church was a purely spiritual entity the greatest that had ever come into the history of the church.

Perhaps a little study by Walther on Luther's character is best placed next to the biographies. Taking, as usual, the rôle of an attorney for the defence, Walther feels called upon to apologize for, or to praise, every single act and trait of his hero, though this is difficult, for the very brilliancy of the man's moral complexion makes the blotches on it stand out all the more distinctly.¹³⁹ An Italian, writing on the same subject, concludes that Luther was a paranoiac afflicted with morbid egotism as a monomania.¹⁴⁰

Of the general histories in which Luther plays a large part no more can be said than to mention by name those of Vedder, Walker, Hulme, Below, W. C. Abbott, G. F. Moore, Bauslin, Taylor, and Preserved Smith.¹⁴¹ But the monographs devoted to an explanation of his influence and place in thought call for

¹³⁷ L. Christiani: *Du Luthéranisme au Protestantisme 1517-28*, 1911.

¹³⁸ A. E. Berger, *Luther in kulturgeschichtlicher Darstellung*. Zweiter Teil, zweite Hälfte, 1919.

¹³⁹ W. Walther, *Luthers Charakter*, 1917. See also N. Söderblom, *Humor och Melankoli och andra Lutherstudier*, Stockholm, 1919.

¹⁴⁰ Rivari, *La mente ed li carattere di Martino Luthero*, 1914.

¹⁴¹ H. C. Vedder, *The Reformation in Germany*, 1913. Good summary, though too severe, of effects of Reformation, pp. 389-393; W. Walker, *History of the Christian Church*, 1918; E. M. Hulme, *The Renaissance, the Protestant Revolution and the Catholic Reformation*, 1914; G. von Below, *Die Ursachen der Reformation*, 1917; W. C. Abbott, *The Expansion of Europe*, 2 vols. 1918; G. F. Moore, *History of Religions*, ii. *Judaism, Christianity, Mohammedanism*, 1919; D. H. Bauslin, *The Lutheran Movement of the Sixteenth Century*, 1919; H. O. Taylor, *Thought and Expression in the Sixteenth Century*, 2 vols. 1920; Preserved Smith, *The Age of the Reformation*, 1920. One might add for the sake of completeness the worthless Catholic review by P. Bernard, 'Pour le quatrième centenaire de la Réformation,' *Études*, Tome 153, pp. 137 ff., 308 ff., 468 ff., 733 ff.; Tome 154, pp. 157 ff., 305 ff., 420 ff. (1917-1918). The famous *Outlines of History* by H. G. Wells has only a few conventional sentences on Luther.

a slightly more specific treatment. First of all, for the sake of convenience, one may put the anthologies, or studies tracing the changing opinion of the Reformer throughout the centuries. To the general reviews by Wentz and Harvey may be added the special studies of estimates of Luther in Germany by Eckart, in France by L. H. Humphrey, and in England by Preserved Smith.¹⁴²

Ernst Troeltsch¹⁴³ continues to defend and develop his view of Luther as a conservative force in religion, to emphasize the likeness of Old Protestantism and Catholicism and their common contrast with the New Protestantism which began in the Enlightenment. Luther's sole object, he urges, was the old one of attaining salvation, and as he sought to attain it in a new way he overemphasized the means at the expense of the end sought, thus finally making the tyranny of dogma unbearable. With Luther, Troeltsch writes:

The assurance of salvation must be based on a miracle in 'order to be certain; but this miracle must be one occurring in the inmost centre of the personal life, and must be clearly intelligible in its whole intellectual significance if it is a miracle which guarantees complete assurance. . . . The sensuous sacramental miracle is done away, and in its stead appears the miracle of thought, that man in his sin and weakness can grasp and confidently assent to such a thought. That is the end of priesthood and hierarchy, the sacramental communication of ethico-religious powers.

Walter Köhler, on the other hand, attributes a high value to the new thought brought in by Luther, finding in him the forerunner of transcendentalism; his greatness was that "he so completely penetrated the objective world of concepts that it lost, not indeed its existence, but its value, and instead of on

¹⁴² A. E. Harvey, 'Martin Luther in the Estimate of Modern Historians,' *American Journal of Theology*, July, 1918; A. R. Wentz, *Martin Luther in the Changing Light of Four Centuries*, 1916; R. Eckart, *Luther und die Reformation im Urteil bedeutender Männer*, 2d ed., 1917; L. H. Humphrey, 'French Estimates of Luther,' *Lutheran Quarterly*, April, 1918; Preserved Smith, 'English Opinion of Luther,' *Harvard Theological Review*, 1917. The last chapter of *The Age of the Reformation* by the same writer is devoted to a history of the historiography of the Reformation.

¹⁴³ E. Troeltsch, *Protestantism and Progress*, 1912, pp. 198, 192 f.; *Id.*, 'Luther und der Protestantismus,' *Neue Rundschau*, October, 1917; *Id.*, 'Protestantismus und Kultur,' *Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart*, 1912. Troeltsch's view that Luther was medieval is exaggerated by R. Wolff, *Studien zu Luthers Weltanschauung*, 1920.

this the postulates by which we live became anchored on the ground of the subject and of its experience.”¹⁴⁴

A judicious and philosophical estimate of the problem of Luther's significance is given by P. Imbart de la Tour.¹⁴⁵ Calling attention to the fact that Luther revolted from the church only in the interests of a larger church, he argues that, though autonomy of religion and conscience would have been the logical result of some of his doctrines, nevertheless in fact, “his completely mystical doctrine of inner inspiration has no resemblance whatever to our subjectivism. The idea of a doctrinal truth and of a religious society always obsessed him.” Imbart de la Tour finds it remarkable that Luther's pessimistic doctrine could succeed in the young, ardent society of the Renaissance, and thinks this success was due to his personality, which was his only true originality. He sums up adversely: “The classic spirit, free institutions, the democratic ideal, all these great forces by which we live are not the heritage of Luther.”

Nietzsche's idea of the Reformation as a great reaction and nothing more is now held in many quarters. The extreme and amusing expression given to it by Anatole France may be quoted on account of its author's fame. After recounting the triumphs of the Renaissance, when men began to revive antiquity and to make discoveries, he continues:¹⁴⁶

From that time the star of the God of the Christians paled and began to set. . . . Already the comely Graces and the Nymphs and Satyrs danced in merry choir; at last the earth rediscovered joy. But, oh horror! oh ill fortune! oh fatal event! A German friar, swollen with beer and theology, set himself against this renascent paganism, threatened it, fulminated against it, prevailed alone against the princes of the church, and, rousing the people,

¹⁴⁴ ‘Luther hat die objective Begriffswelt so völlig durchdrungen, das sie zwar nicht ihre Existenz, wohl aber ihren Wert verlor, und statt dessen der Anker der Lebensbehauptung auf den Boden des Subjects und seiner Erfahrung fiel.’ *Luther und die deutsche Reformation*, 1916. Santayana would agree with Troeltsch in this statement, but would deplore instead of exulting in it. See his *Egotism in German Philosophy*, 1917, pp. 1 ff., 23.

¹⁴⁵ ‘Luther,’ in *Revue des Deux Mondes*, 1912, 6^{me} période, pp. 309 ff.; the same reprinted in *Les Origines de la Réforme*, iii, 1914, chap. 1; *Id.*, ‘Pourquoi Luther n’a-t-il pas créé qu’un Christianisme allemand?’ *Revue de Métaphysique et de Morale*, 1918, pp. 575–612.

¹⁴⁶ A. France, *La Révolte des Anges*, 1914, pp. 237 ff.

led them to a reform which saved what was about to be destroyed. . . . This robust sailor repaired, caulked, and relaunched the derelict bark of the church. Jesus Christ owes it to this scamp of a friar that his shipwreck was put off for perhaps more than ten centuries. From this time things went from bad to worse. After the big fellow with the cowl, drunken and quarrelsome, came the long, dry doctor of Geneva, full of the spirit of the antique Jehovah, who tried to force the world back to the abominable times of Joshua and the Judges of Israel, a madman in his cold fury, a heretic burning heretics, the most savage enemy of the Graces.

From the opposite point of view the Catholic admits and laments the same facts. For Hilaire Belloc the Reformation was the turning back of the tide of culture and Christianity represented by the Catholic Church, and Luther was "one of those exuberant, sensual, rather inconsequential, characters," who did not know what he was doing, or what he wanted to do.¹⁴⁷

The same view of Luther as the great reactionary is set forth by Havelock Ellis, who speaks of him as "the gigantic peasant who, with too exuberant energy, battered the dying church into acute sensibility, kicked it into emotion, galvanized it into life, prolonged its existence a thousand years."¹⁴⁸ The subject of Luther's personality has drawn from his pen an original, if not quite exhaustive, study.¹⁴⁹ He calls him an "adept in the culture of his land and day, eagerly devoted to literature, a poet, a good musician, accomplished in the mechanical uses of his hands, the intimate friend of Cranach, a skilful dialectician," and "a true German in his close combination, alike in speech and act, of the abstract with the realistic, of the emotional with the material." Notwithstanding coarseness and "a spitefulness once termed feminine," there is in him "something homely, human, genial, almost lovable."

Among the popular writers to pay their respects to the Reformer the Irish novelist George Moore has taken his place. Having written an absurd drama on St. Paul and an obscene biography of Jesus, he at one time designed to construct a five-act play on Luther's career.¹⁵⁰ Mercifully, perhaps, he

¹⁴⁷ H. Belloc, *Europe and the Faith*, 1920, pp. 219 f.

¹⁴⁸ Havelock Ellis, *Impressions and Comments*, 1915.

¹⁴⁹ H. Ellis, *The Philosophy of Conflict*, second series, 1919, pp. 89-99.

¹⁵⁰ George Moore, *Confessions of a Young Man*, 1886, new ed. 1917, p. 161; on the drama see further, *Salve*, 1912, pp. 183, 191 ff.; *Vale*, 1914, p. 104.

got no further than the dedication, a French sonnet to Swinburne, worth quoting for its popular interest:

Accepte, tu verras la foi mêlée au crime
Se souiller dans le sang sacré de la raison,
Quand surgit, redempteur du vieux peuple saxon,
Luther à Wittemberg comme Christ à Solime.

These interesting outbursts express in unbridled language the not uncommon conviction that the Reformation was essentially a reaction. Many voices ¹⁵¹ have been raised on both sides of the hotly debated problem; it is amusing to notice another popular writer speaking of Luther in exactly opposite terms, as the restorer and not the destroyer of the antique paganism. Gilbert Keith Chesterton writes: "That great and human, but very pagan person, Martin Luther . . . was a sign of the break-up of Catholicism, but was not a builder of Protestantism. . . . He was an anarchist and therefore a dreamer." ¹⁵²

Professor Arthur C. McGiffert, who once saw in Luther "the conservative and intolerant" man who "introduced a régime of religious bigotry for a long time as narrow and as blighting to intellectual growth as Roman Catholicism at its worst," ¹⁵³ and whose "ideals of liberty were not ours," now ¹⁵⁴ asserts: "Not justification by faith is the central principle of the Protestant Reformation, but freedom for human service." Professor W. W. Rockwell's summary account of "Luther and the Catholic Church" ¹⁵⁵ is well worth reading for its combined

¹⁵¹ A. von Harnack, 'Die Reformation,' *Internationale Monatsschrift*, xi, 1918; M. Lenz, 'Luthers Weltgeschichtliche Stellung,' *Preussische Jahrbücher*, clxx (1917), pp. 165 ff.; F. Heiler, *Luthers religionsgeschichtliche Bedeutung*, 1918; *Revue de Métaphysique et de Morale*, 1918, articles by C. A. Bernoulli, 'La Réforme de Luther et les problèmes de la culture présente'; E. Ehrhardt, 'Le sens de la révolution religieuse et morale accomplie par Luther'; J. Chevalier, 'Les deux Réformes: le Luthéranisme en Allemagne, le Calvinisme dans les pays de langue anglaise'; C. Andler, 'L'esprit conservateur et l'esprit révolutionnaire dans le Luthéranisme.'

¹⁵² G. K. Chesterton, *The Crimes of England*, 1918. Cf. also his *Irish Impressions*, 1920, p. 206.

¹⁵³ *Martin Luther: The Man and His Work*, 1911, p. 382.

¹⁵⁴ 'The Unfinished Reformation,' in *Bulletin of Union Theological Seminary*, October 31, 1917.

¹⁵⁵ *Ibid.*

judiciousness and brilliance of statement. My own estimate of Luther and the Reformation has often been given, and need not be repeated here.¹⁵⁶

The connection between the Reformation and the Great War has received attention in a large number of books, of which only a few can be mentioned here.¹⁵⁷ Paquier, the French Catholic, holds that Luther was largely responsible for the war by his teaching of blind obedience to the state, by his separation of inward justification from outward works, by his express approval of war, and by his brutality and chauvinism. Weiss, a French Protestant, asserts that the war is an apostasy from Luther's doctrine, though the actions of the Germans in it might have been foretold in his saying, "We Germans are and remain Germans, that is, swine and beasts without reason." Kawerau, a German Protestant, mobilizes Luther in favor of an active prosecution of the war and quotes his severe judgments of French, English, and Italians. Bishop Hensley Henson,¹⁵⁸ in a sermon preached on the quadricentenary festival of the Reformation, exonerates Luther from responsibility for the subsequent growth of German materialism and militarism. On the contrary, "his supreme and unassailable merit," Henson thinks, "lies in the fact that he led the way in a process of spiritual emancipation. . . . He was cast in a large mould and was never consciously false to his perception of truth."

Three special topics for which no convenient place has been found in the above summary, must perforce be put in the ap-

¹⁵⁶ *Life and Letters of Martin Luther*, 1911, and preface to second edition, 1914; 'Luther,' in *International Encyclopaedia*, 1918; 'Luther 1517-1917,' *Outlook*, October 31, 1917; 'The Reformation 1517-1917,' *Bibliotheca Sacra*, January, 1918; 'The Reformation interpreted in the Light of its Achievements,' Paper read at American Historical Association, December, 1917, to be printed in *Papers of the American Society of Church History; The Age of the Reformation*, 1920.

¹⁵⁷ J. Paquier, *Luther et l'Allemagne*, 1918, with list of books on the subject, pp. viii ff.; N. Weiss, 'Pour le quatrième centenaire de la Réformation,' *Bulletin de la Société de l'Histoire du Protestantisme Français*, 1917, pp. 178 ff.; K. Kawerau, *Luthers Gedanken über den Krieg*, 1916; E. Vermeil, 'Les aspects religieux de la guerre,' *Revue de Métaphysique et de Morale*, 1918, pp. 893-921; J. A. Faulkner: 'Luther and the Great War,' *Lutheran Quarterly*, October, 1920, pp. 448 ff.

¹⁵⁸ *Sermons*, 1918, p. 274. Cf. Preserved Smith, 'Luther and the Hohenzollerns,' *Outlook*, April 23, 1919.

pendix to this report. Lauchert ¹⁵⁹ has made an interesting and thorough study of the opposition to Luther in Italy; E. Wolff ¹⁶⁰ has tried to prove that the Faust of the original German Faust Book was a parody of Luther, this Faust being a professor at Wittenberg, learned and fond of drinking, his marriage with Helena recalling the Catholic parody of the wedding of Catharine von Bora, and the appearance before the emperor that of his call to Worms; even his compact with the devil being such as an apostate might make. An American student ¹⁶¹ has found the missing link between Luther and Shakespeare in the "mooncalf" adopted by the English poet apparently from a translation of the Reformer's work of that name.

¹⁵⁹ F. Lauchert, *Die italienischen literarischen Gegner Luthers*, 1912.

¹⁶⁰ E. Wolff, *Faust und Luther*, 1912. Luther is discussed in F. B. Busoni's new opera, *Doktor Faust*, 1920. The libretto is not from Goethe, but is original.

¹⁶¹ Preserved Smith, 'The Mooncalf,' *Modern Philology*, January, 1914.

THE CHRONOLOGICAL SCHEME OF ACTS

BENJAMIN WISNER BACON

YALE UNIVERSITY

THE article 'Chronology of the New Testament' by C. H. Turner in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible* marks an epoch in this important subject. Its astronomical and calendar data are indeed not unimpeachable, for the more recent studies of Fotheringham¹ make it highly probable that A.D. 30 should be taken as the year of the crucifixion, rather than Turner's date of A.D. 29. But Turner's careful survey of ancient sources proves that from a very early time "the year of the two Gemini" (A.D. 29) was fixed upon by tradition, and became the accepted starting-point for primitive reckonings in both directions. Convenience of adjustment to the paschal cycle had probably much to do with the adoption of this particular year, which facilitated harmonization; but at the very early period to which it can be carried back tradition is not likely to have varied more than a year or two from the correct date for so all-important an event. While, then, a slightly earlier or later absolute dating, such as A.D. 30, may obtain the preference of modern chronographers it seems not impossible that the traditional date of 29 A.D. for the crucifixion may go back to the period of Luke himself.²

A second contribution of value in the article referred to is Turner's observation (p. 421) that the picture of the Book of Acts "is cut up, as it were, into six panels, each labelled with a general summary of progress," the protagonist in the first three being St. Peter, in the last three St. Paul; so that "the two halves into which the book thus naturally falls make almost equal divisions at the middle of the whole period covered." It is no surprise to find this view of the structure of Acts adopted in so standard a work as Moffatt's *Introduction to the*

¹ *Journal of Philology*, xxix (1903), and *Journal of Theological Studies*, xii (1910), 45.

² The name "Luke" which tradition assigns to the author of the third Gospel and Book of Acts is employed in the present article without prejudice to the question of real authorship.

New Testament, for as to the division there can be no doubt, while the reader who carefully examines the recurrent rubric of Acts 6, 7; 9, 31; 12, 24; 16, 5, and 19, 20 will readily see from its relation to the context that the author really does employ it to subdivide his work according to subject matter. It seems the more surprising that in a chronological enquiry such as Turner's the critic should not first attempt to estimate the length of time required for the series of events related in each of the successive 'panels,' so as to do full justice to the Lukan chronology in and for itself, before introducing outside considerations such as the conveniences of travel, or the requirements of Paul or Josephus, in the attempt to reach an ultimate chronology. Right method would seem to suggest that we first get clearly the author's own idea before seeking to adjust it to others. Unfortunately Turner's subdivision of the story of Gentile evangelization in Acts 13-28 into periods of longer or shorter duration (p. 421b) is made almost without reference to the Lukan divisions at 12, 24; 16, 5; and 19, 20.

A recent article by Professor C. J. Cadoux in *The Journal of Theological Studies*³ entitled 'The Chronological Divisions of Acts' adduces some further considerations which should be taken into the account, if Turner's discovery is to have proper valuation. Here, too, unfortunately, we can give no sweeping endorsement.

It can hardly be conceded to Cadoux that the closing sentence of the book (Acts 28, 31) should be counted as one of the 'rubrics.' Its whole tenor and purpose are different, and there is little or no resemblance even in language. More could be said for including in the series Acts 2, 47b ("And the Lord added to their number daily those that were being saved"), though even here we are inclined to attribute the clause to the source only, and to explain the resemblance of its language to the five 'refrains' from the compiler's having taken the idea — and to some extent the language — of his summary from this passage. An almost exact parallel can be found in the rubric employed by the compiler of our first Gospel in Matt. 7, 28; 11, 1; 13, 53; 19, 1, and 26, 1 to divide his five 'books' of the

³ Vol. xix (1917-18), pp. 333-341.

teaching of Jesus, prefaced each by its introductory narrative, from one another and from the epilogue. A comparison of Luke 7, 1 (β text) taking into consideration the peculiarities of the idiom will show that the refrain is not a creation of our first evangelist, but is merely adopted (like a whole series of similarly stereotyped phrases) from the source he is following. However, even Cadoux himself does not regard Acts 1, 1-2, 47 as a separate 'panel,' but as merely "introductory"; and since the other addition he would make is at the end, where a natural terminus is reached anyway, his scheme for the division of Acts into seven parts does not differ at all "chronologically" and but very little otherwise, from Turner's into six. Cadoux's really important contribution to the subject lies elsewhere. It is a suggested explanation of the principle on which the various stages of the story have been marked off by the 'refrain.'

Moffatt⁴ in adopting Turner's division had spoken of the refrain as summarizing each section "by a rubric of progress"; but he takes the word "progress" in the geographical sense. Cadoux rejects this on grounds which seem quite adequate, and reverts to the view of Turner that the stages marked off are chronological. We may venture to transcribe the extract which he makes from the well-known article:

It remains only to adjust, by the help of these points, the division into periods (see p. 421b), which is the single hint at a chronology supplied by St. Luke in the earlier part of his work. . . . That the chronology here adopted (*i.e.* Turner's) results in a more or less even division of periods — i. from A.D. 29; ii. from A.D. 35; iii. from A.D. 39-40; iv. from A.D. 45-46; v. from A.D. 50; vi. from A.D. 55 (to A.D. 61) — such as St. Luke seems to be contemplating, must be considered a slight step towards its verification (Hastings, Dictionary of the Bible, i, p. 424).

It is also quite apparent that Turner's dates require readjustment by reference to the well-known inscription at Delphi, from which the pro-consulship of Gallio in Achaia can be dated in A.D. 51-52. This is now commonly regarded as furnishing our most reliable *point d'appui* for the chronology of Paul. It is true, as Cadoux observes, that Turner "makes no use of it"; but this is pardonable since the discovery was not made known until six years after the appearance of his article. It is, how-

⁴ *Introduction to the New Testament*, pp. 284 f.

ever, a striking confirmation of Turner's results that his date for Paul's arrival in Corinth is less than a year later than that deduced by Deissmann from the inscription. A discussion of Pauline chronology by the present writer which appeared in the same year with Turner's came six months nearer still; but that is attributable to good luck rather than to good scholarship.⁵ Turner himself would probably concede a correction on this ground of perhaps a year in his later dates.

If we make the slight correction required by the Delphi inscription, and in addition identify the visit of Paul and Barnabas to Jerusalem of Acts 11, 30 with that which Paul also records as his *second* in Gal. 2, 1-10, as many leading scholars now demand, Turner's chronology will be verified in even higher degree than its author claims — so Cadoux maintains — by comparison with the Lukan division. For since the first and last of the *seven* 'refrains' counted by Cadoux coincide with the beginning and end of the total period, extending from the crucifixion (A.D. 29-30) to the end of Paul's stay in Rome (A.D. 59-60) the whole will consist of some thirty years, as Turner's chronology requires. Acts, like the Gospel, will cover a period of 30-31 years. But in addition — and this is the important point — the intervening five 'refrains' will appear to be so distributed by the historian as to mark off his narrative into periods of approximately five years, of which three are given to the work of Peter and the Twelve in Palestine, while the remaining three are occupied by the Gentile missions of Paul, which start from Antioch. Starting from Passover A.D. 29 these five-year periods will be reckoned as follows:

Founding of the church to Martyrdom of Stephen (Acts 6, 7)	A.D. 29-34
Expansion in Palestine to Conversion of Paul (9, 31)	34-39
Beginnings of Gentile Evangelization to Death of Agrippa (12, 24)	39-44
Antiochian Missions to Distribution of Decrees (16, 5)	44-49
Greek Missions to Founding of Ephesian Church (19, 20)	49-54
Delegation to Jerusalem to Paul's Witness at Rome (end of Acts)	54-59 (60)

The end of the Lukan narrative leaves the terminus of Paul's activity somewhat vague. By what event it was marked does

⁵ See Bacon, *Introduction to New Testament*, 1900, p. 280, comparing the preliminary studies in *Expositor* V, lix, lx (November and December, 1899). The date arrived at, is "spring of 50." Deissmann's is "early in 50"; Turner's "fall of 50."

not appear; but the data of 28, 11-13 carry us on to only a month or two from the succeeding Passover, the beginning season of the series. Otherwise the summaries might be exact, and certainly coincide with principal divisions of the subject.⁶ Moreover the third refrain, brief as it is, surpasses all in the clearness with which it coincides with a strongly marked transition. The story here passes from the apostleship of Peter among the Circumcision to the apostleship of Paul among the Gentiles. There is further good fortune in the fact that in this case we can also positively control the datings. For the narrative of Josephus also implies the summer of A.D. 44 as the date for the death of Agrippa. On the other hand we have no means of controlling the other dates save, *first*, inference from the Pauline Epistles, *second*, the requirements of time implied in Paul and in the Lukan narrative itself. Cadoux's theory of "the chronological divisions of Acts" must stand the double test, *first*, of real consonance with the Lukan grouping of material, *second* of agreement with absolute chronology.

1. The placing of the refrain in Acts 6, 7 is somewhat peculiar, since we clearly have at 6, 1 a transition in subject matter, and (in the general judgment of those who at all admit distinctions of sources used by the compiler) transition to a new source as well. With Acts 6, 1 we enter a new environment, and meet presuppositions unexplained in the preceding narrative. We also proceed to wholly new interests and a new outlook. The source-critic will be disposed to look upon this opening paragraph (6, 1-6) as largely reconstructed by the editor in the effort to adapt his extract from the new source (Antiochian?) to the narrative already framed.⁷ The upshot of the editorial changes is that the seven Hellenistic leaders, who both by their actual work and by subsequent reference (Acts 21, 8) are really "evangelists," are transformed into subordinates to the Apostles. They relieve the twelve of the task of "serving

⁶ On the placing of refrains 1 and 4, see below. In both cases it is necessary to distinguish the compiler's point of view from that of the sources he employs.

⁷ See Bacon 'Stephen's Speech' in *Contributions by the Semitic and Biblical Faculty*, Yale Bicentennial Publications, 1901. The references in 6, 8 and 11, 18 suggest a special interest in Antioch.

tables," and become an order of "deacons"⁸ in the mother church, ranking below the Apostles but above "the widows," who also now appear for the first time, and quite unexpectedly. Considering this opening paragraph (Acts 6, 1-6) to be largely bridge-work of the editorial character described, the very object of which is to minimize the gap between disparate sources by assigning a place for the new *dramatis personae* in the existing framework, it is not surprising that the retrospective summary should be postponed until the editor has completed his account of the organization of the mother church. He can proceed more appropriately thereafter with his story of the dispersal by persecution. From the point of view, then, of the ultimate compiler the refrain of Acts 6, 7 stands just where it ought. It looks back over and sums up the story of the establishment of the mother church in Jerusalem, the "church of the Apostles and Elders." The position of the fourth refrain (16, 5) seems to be chosen with equal care on similar grounds. For this story of development five years is a very reasonable time.

Again the date A.D. 34 for the outbreak of "the persecution which arose about Stephen" (8, 1; 11, 19) is probable on external grounds if sufficient allowance be made for the Lukan tendency to transform a scene of mere uncontrolled mob violence into a formal trial and condemnation before the Sanhedrin. The outbreak against Stephen and the Hellenists (Acts 8, 1 explicitly excepts "the Apostles" from its effects) would be quite conceivable in the last years of Pilate, somewhat more so than under his immediate successors. On both internal and external evidence A.D. 29-34 seems, therefore, a reasonable conception of date to have been entertained by the compiler.

2. What, then, of the period of expansion described in Acts 6-8, during which in spite of persecution the gospel was carried both northward to Samaria and southward through Philistia to the border of Egypt?

Luke concludes his story of this development with a glowing account of the conversion of the persecutor and his early witness in Damascus and Jerusalem. If the account be properly interpreted by its own implications solely, without intrusive

⁸ The actual term appears only in the β text.

influence from Galatians upon our judgment of Luke's meaning, this early preaching will be understood as antedating but slightly the close of the period. Standing where it does it might possibly be regarded as falling in part within the limits of the next; for it is notoriously in Lukan style to introduce proleptically at the close of his sections material which really belongs later, but serves to carry on the thread of connection.⁹ Here, however, no such extreme assumption is required. The natural understanding will be that Paul's conversion, beginning of work in Jerusalem, and escape through Caesarea to Tarsus fell toward the close of this period, *i.e.*, in A.D. 37-39. In order to pass upon the question whether Luke really intends his second refrain summarizing the growth of the church "throughout all Judaea and Galilee and Samaria" (Acts 9, 31) to mark the year 39 A.D. we must here pause for some further enquiry as to the datings implied in the period of the Hellenistic persecution, in particular that of the conversion of Paul.

i. Considered in themselves, without reference to Galatians, the events related in Acts 6, 8-9, 31 would fall quite naturally and easily within the limits 34-39 A.D. This being so, we have no right to say that these were not the limits actually in the mind of Luke, even if they fail to agree with data derived from Galatians. For the wide divergence of Luke in just this portion of his work from the data of Galatians makes it quite supposable that he is here somewhat in error. On the other hand it is not wholly insupposable that current datings of Paul's conversion based on Gal. 2, 1 may be ten years out of the way, since a group of scholars are ready to adopt the conjecture of Grotius changing the reading of Gal. 2, 1 from "fourteen" to "four" years by the omission of a single *i*. The supposition, then, that Luke intends his second division to cover a period corresponding to the years 34-39 A.D. has nothing against it save the unwarranted assumption that he must agree with the date for Paul's conversion implied in Gal. 2, 1.

ii. Paul's escape from Damascus as related in Acts 9, 23-25 is referred to by himself in 2 Cor. 11, 32 as having taken place

⁹ So Luke 24, 44-53, with which compare Acts 1, 6-9. Acts 11, 30 is susceptible of similar interpretation.

while the city was being guarded by the ethnarch "under Aretas the king." Not one of the interpretations thus far proposed is wholly successful in removing the difficulty in understanding how this could be possible at any date earlier than 37-38 A.D., when Damascus probably did pass into the control of Aretas. Under Roman control, which can be traced with certainty from its coinage down to A.D. 33-34, and on other less cogent evidence down to the second summer of Caligula's reign (A.D. 38), Paul the Roman citizen would hardly have been forced to such ignominious means of egress. So far as the Epistles are concerned there is no need to connect this escape with Paul's stay in Damascus *immediately* following his conversion. It might equally well be assigned to the subsequent period of which he writes in Gal. 1, 17, "Again I *returned* to Damascus." But Acts connects it with the conversion. According to the exact sense of Acts 9, 23 it was only "some days" (*ἡμέραι ἱκαναί*) afterward. The time was in fact so short that when the fugitive reached Jerusalem the astounding news of his conversion to the faith he set out to persecute had not even then been conveyed to the brotherhood. Between this escape and the escape from Jerusalem, Luke inserts nothing but Paul's interrupted work to the Hellenists of that city. Is it not reasonable to suppose that he really means to date the conversion of Paul in A.D. 37-38, even if he did not know that Damascus was then "under Aretas the king"?

iii. Were we at liberty to alter the reading of Gal. 2, 1 from 'fourteen' to 'four' years the terminal dates of the Pauline chronology would easily fall in line with Acts, however wide the discrepancy as to the nature of the Apostle's work before coming to Antioch and as to the intervening date of his first visit to Jerusalem. As already suggested we must either throw out altogether the Lukan report of a 'famine-relief' visit, or identify it, as Paul's *second*, with that of Gal. 2, 1-10. For the idea (still maintained by Turner) that Paul could pass over such a visit unmentioned in Gal. 1, 18-24 is inadmissible. On this point even champions of Lukan infallibility are at last willing to concede something to Paul. The occasion referred to in Acts 11, 30 and Gal. 2, 1 must be the same; but what of the

difference as to agenda? An answer to this question will involve some discussion of Luke's relation to his sources.

Of all the sections of Acts the four verses here concerned (11, 27-30) are among the least reliable. From verse 22 we expect action of some sort on the question of the admission of Gentiles, for this was the object of Barnabas' mission to Antioch. Paul, in Gal. 2, 1-10, gives exactly what we should expect; but Luke gives something else. He defers the settlement of the pending question of the admission of uncircumcised Gentiles till after the First Missionary Journey (Acts 13-14), when Paul and Barnabas on an alleged *third* visit to Jerusalem can meet the objections raised by the Mosaists with an appeal like that of Peter in 11, 1-18 to "the signs and wonders God had wrought through them among the Gentiles." This first section (verses 1-11) of Luke's story of the Apostolic Council is in fact little else than a parallel in the compiler's own words to the story told by his source in 11, 1-18 (cf. β text). Acts 15, 1-11 could easily be reconciled with Paul if it stood in the place now occupied by 11, 27-30. The rest of the story of the Council tells of a settlement, by means of the four "decrees" adopted at the instance of James, of the further question on what basis believing "Jews which are among the Gentiles" are to 'eat and associate' with their Gentile brethren. All are to be protected from "the pollutions of idols" by certain rules of "abstinence." The difficulty of reconciling this with Paul's account of his controversy with Peter at Antioch, and with his uniform treatment of the issue at stake, is notorious. But one could hardly expect an Antiochian writer¹⁰ whose attitude toward Peter and James is that displayed in Acts to tell the story as Gal. 2, 11-21 reveals it. If, however, the whole question was to Luke's mind determined by the "decrees" proposed by James at the council of "the Apostles and Elders" at Jerusalem, it seems probable that he would assign another motive for the visit recorded in 11, 22 ff.

What then, of this story of famine-relief? Its chief actor is a

¹⁰ Very ancient tradition recorded in the Old Latin prologues, and referred to by Eusebius, makes the author a native of Antioch. The tradition is strongly corroborated by the internal evidence.

prophet named Agabus, who came down from Jerusalem to Antioch and predicted "a great famine over all the world (*οἰκουμένη*), which came to pass in the days of Claudius." Agabus is known to us from the most reliable of Luke's sources in 21, 10-12. But, here, in the Travel Document, where Agabus meets Paul at Caesarea with an entreaty not to imperil his life at Jerusalem, he appears as a previously unknown character. He must be introduced to the reader as "a certain prophet." Moreover there is no indication that he has ever met Paul before, or even visited Antioch. He "came down from Judaea." Equally unreliable is the story of church action which takes the place in Acts occupied in the Pauline Epistles by the great contribution of the Greek churches "for the poor among the saints that are at Jerusalem" (Rom. 15, 26). The Antioch church may possibly have followed the famous example of the royal convert Helena of Adiabene in 45-46, and may have made Barnabas and Saul bearers of its gift. But this was not the main occasion for the journey; nor was it *this* contribution, but that of the Pauline churches, which called for mention at the hands of an impartial historian.

Again we may assume, in order to meet the implications of Luke's order, that there was another famine in 40-41.^{10a} But it fails to appear in any other record, unless the *assiduae sterilitates* which according to Suetonius distinguished the reign of Claudius are called in to aid. *The* famine made memorable to all Jews as well by its severity as by the liberality of Helena began at least a year after the death of Agrippa, extending over the procuratorship of Tiberius Alexander (46-47), after having started under his predecessor, Cuspius Fadus (45-46). Luke may have been misled by the Aramaic word ארעא ('land,' or 'earth') as Torrey conjectures, into regarding the famine as world-wide (*οἰκουμένη*); but he certainly misconceives its extent, since if it had not been limited to Palestine Antioch would have been no better off than Jerusalem, and (unless we take refuge in our ignorance by assuming some other famine) he is equally at sea regarding its date. For he takes pains to insert the mission of Paul and Barnabas to relieve it *before* his

^{10a} So Harnack.

account of the persecution and death of Agrippa, under the vague statement that it "came to pass in the days of Claudius," while the return of the envoys accompanied by Mark ¹¹ is related immediately *after*. Luke seems thus to have a perfectly correct idea of the date of Agrippa's death, with which he interlocks very closely the visit of Paul and Barnabas to Jerusalem; but he has a very vague idea of the date of the famine, as he indicates by introducing his digression to tell the fortunes of the mother church with the words "Now about that time" (κατ' ἐκείνον δὲ τὸν καιρὸν). Doubtless he knew the date of Agrippa's accession (41) "in the days of Claudius," but he does not seem to recognize the persecution as an *initial* policy. He thinks of the famine as occurring *ca.* A.D. 43-44, and therefore places the delegation from Antioch before the account of Agrippa's persecution and death. But by placing the return of the envoys *after* the royal demise he indicates his belief that this, at all events, was not earlier than the end of 44. Now if his refrain is really intended to divide the story chronologically into (approximate) pentads his date for the conversion of Paul will be, as we have seen, A.D. 37-38. His date for the visit to Jerusalem will be 44-45. It is certainly noteworthy that this should agree so closely with Gal. 2, 1 as emended. For if we read here 'four' instead of 'fourteen,' and count both termini (as the rule of antiquity requires) in the intervals named in Gal. 1, 18 and 2, 1, Paul also will be reckoning six years from his conversion to his visit with Barnabas to Jerusalem; and this on other grounds cannot be dated far from A.D. 44-45, where Luke seems to place it.

Finally the date of "fourteen years" in 2 Cor. 12, 2 will be found to fall in quite as smoothly with this Lukan scheme. The passage in question belongs to the last months of Paul's stay in Ephesus ¹² or slightly later. By Turner's dating, corrected in conformity to the Delphi inscription, this would be *ca.* 54-55, bringing the vision referred to into the period of

¹¹ Mentioned in the source (12, 12) in the phrase Luke employs in 12, 25, "John whose surname was Mark."

¹² On the supposition that 2 Cor. 10, 1-13, 10 is a fragment of the painful letter of self-commendation referred to in 2 Cor. 2, 3-9; 3, 1.

Paul's stay in "Arabia" (Gal. 1, 17). It might even be brought into a certain correspondence with Luke's account of a vision in the temple (Acts 22, 17-21), since both would mark the beginning of Paul's ministry to the Gentiles. In all respects save the inconvenient *l* of Gal. 2, 1 the date A.D. 39 (in absolute reckoning 40) for the retrospective rubric Acts 9, 31 is unexceptionable.

It does *not* follow that we are at liberty to make the emendation. The business of the exegete is not to change his texts, but to interpret them. Moreover the Grotian emendation falls very far short of removing the discrepancies between Acts 9, 1-30 and Gal. 1, 11-24. On the one side we have a ministry to (Greek-speaking) Jews in Judaea (Jerusalem-Caesarea); on the other a ministry to the Gentiles in "Syria and Cilicia." On the one side a flight from Damascus, after "some days" witness for Christ in the synagogues, to the mother church in Jerusalem; on the other an express denial of "going up to Jerusalem to those that were Apostles before me," and a going away into Arabia, followed (one would infer shortly) by a "return to Damascus." On the one side a work of evangelization among the Greek-speaking Jews in Jerusalem in constant relation with the leaders of the mother church interrupted only by the outbreak (stereotyped in Luke) of Jewish jealousy in mob violence;¹³ on the other a work of evangelization in Damascus lasting for three years (minus the stay in Arabia), and terminated by a two-weeks' visit privately to Peter in Jerusalem. On the one side a flight from Jerusalem to Caesarea and a stay there under protection of the church until "the brethren" send the fugitive to his native city of Tarsus; on the other missionary activity "in Syria and Cilicia" in such complete independence of the churches of Christ in Judaea¹⁴ that the Apostle's very face was unknown to them. "They only heard by report, He that once persecuted us now preacheth the faith of which he once made havoc." As respects the nature and sphere of Paul's activity the disagreement could hardly be

¹³ Not to be reconciled with Acts 22, 17-21, where Paul's departure is occasioned by a vision in the temple forestalling the outbreak.

¹⁴ In Pauline usage "Judaea" includes Caesarea, the principal port, and metropolis of Samaria.

greater. The author of Acts is certainly not well informed on this part of Paul's career, and has exactly the opposite idea as to how his apostolic authority should be vindicated. It does not follow that Luke may not have conceived the conversion as having taken place in A.D. 37-38. If the Grotian emendation were admitted the interval assumed by Acts 11, 30; 12, 25 of six (?) years between the conversion and the second visit would be substantially correct. Looking back, then, over this 'panel' of Acts, its evidence must be held to confirm Cadoux's theory, that (whether correctly or not) the author employs his retrospective rubrics for the purpose of subdividing his story into periods of *five* years. His second period, that of the spread of the gospel throughout "Judaea, Samaria, and Galilee" in consequence of "the persecution that arose about Stephen," is brought to a signal close by the conversion of the arch-persecutor, and a brief season (one year?) of "peace." He may well have conceived it to end with the first decade from the crucifixion, in A.D. 39; for which we may substitute 40 if the crucifixion be dated in 30.

3. The next 'panel' (9, 32-12, 24), which closed, as we have seen, with the persecution and death of Agrippa, covers the beginnings of (sporadic) Gentile conversions under Peter, and includes the founding of the church in Antioch. So far as internal indications go it might well be taken to require about five years in the view of the narrator. Certainly the event which brings it to so dramatic an end must be dated, as we have seen, in the summer of 44. In reality Agrippa's death took place but fourteen years and some months after the crucifixion, if we are right in dating the latter in 30 A.D. But as Luke seems to date it in 29 he probably counts fifteen and a fraction for the whole period, and five for the present 'panel' as well as for each of the two preceding. As the ultimate terminus falls about February 1 according to Acts 28, 11, 30, the entire story covers more nearly 31 than 30 years; but if the author considers the fractional ten months, they are about equally divided between the two halves of the book, since the death of Agrippa occurred several months after the Passover, which was the starting point.

With the exception of the founding of the church in Antioch and the connected incident of the sending famine-relief to Jerusalem (11, 19-30), this whole section is devoted to two incidents in the story of Peter related with exceptional detail in most graphic style. They are, *first*, his inauguration of work for the conversion of the Gentiles (9, 32-11, 18), and, *second*, his miraculous deliverance from the sword of the persecutor (12, 1-24). These two elements appear to be both taken from the same source, a narrative whose hero is Peter, and whose author shows such minute acquaintance with conditions in the mother church that it is commonly designated the Jerusalem source. The intervening verses (11, 19-30) on the other hand may be attributed to a source whose interests centre at Antioch. But the two sections from the Jerusalem source would also seem to have been inverted in order by Luke. For Peter is clearly assumed to be in permanent residence at Jerusalem throughout chapter 12 down to the point where he takes leave of James and departs "to another place"; whereas in the story of 9, 32-11, 18, especially in the Western form of the text of 11, 1f.,¹⁵ he is no longer a permanent resident of Jerusalem, but is occupied in visitation of "the saints" in "all parts" including Lydda, where the church already had its guild of "widows," and whence the whole plain of Sharon is evangelized (9, 35). Joppa, where "Simon the tanner" is Peter's host, and doubtless that of the church also, became his headquarters for so long a time that he is able to take "six brethren" from their number as his supporters and witnesses for the momentous occasions at Caesarea and Jerusalem (11, 12). It is true that we have no external means of dating the conversion of the centurion of the "Italian Cohort" stationed at Caesarea, since (as Torrey ap-

¹⁵ The β text has: "And report came to the Apostles and to the brethren that were in Judaea that the Gentiles also had received the word of God. *Now Peter for a considerable time had wished to journey to Jerusalem. So when he had called the brethren unto him and had established them, making a long discourse, he (went) through the districts teaching them. And when he was come up to Jerusalem,*" etc. Either the α text obtains a closer adjustment to the context by trimming off the protruding corner (printed in italic) which still remained to resist a smooth bedding of the section in its new situation, or the β text shows consciousness of the duplication by imitating the parallels. Cf. 15, 2-3; 20, 17 ff.

pears to have shown in opposition to the present writer) the difficulties in the way of conceiving Cornelius in the situation here represented while the country was still under the rule of a (nominally) independent *socius rex* — difficulties which lead Preuschen to declare that the statement “must rest on some misunderstanding”¹⁶ — are not insuperable. But there is further internal evidence for the transposition, and this has no unimportant bearing on our present enquiry.

Peter’s vision at Joppa, with the subsequent account of the planting of the gospel at Caesarea, and vindication of Peter’s course to the satisfaction of the authorities at Jerusalem even as to the question of “eating with the Gentiles” (11, 3), carries us far beyond the point of development reached by the general Lukan narrative. It is already a serious discrepancy that the source of 8, 40 (Antiochian?) attributes the beginnings of the church in Caesarea to Philip the evangelist; and this is confirmed by 21, 8, where Philip’s house in Caesarea becomes Paul’s abiding place. But in addition the revelation to Peter in the Jerusalem source is certainly not intended by the original writer for the restricted application made of it by the compiler. Peter is divinely instructed as to two things: *first*, That “God is no respecter of persons, but that in every nation he that feareth Him and worketh righteousness is accepted of Him”; *second*, that his Jewish scruples against eating “anything common or unclean” are of human, not divine origin (10, 13–15), and should be no barrier to his “joining himself or coming unto one of another nation” (10, 28; cf. 11, 3). In other words we have a complete settlement on a basis more than Pauline in its liberalism of the entire question covered in the succeeding context from 11, 19 to 15, 29; and the settlement concerns not its first phase only (freedom of Gentiles from the Mosaic ordinances), but its second also (conduct of “the Jews which are among the Gentiles”). Thus all the great questions to whose working out the remainder of Acts is devoted already receive their authoritative and final decision by Divine revelation endorsed by official action of the mother church in this single story of how Peter planted the gospel among Gentiles in Caesarea.

¹⁶ Commentary, ad loc. in the *Handbuch zum Neuen Testament*.

The settlements implied in the teaching of the vision that distinctions of meats are a human convention without warrant in the sight of the Creator ¹⁷ and in the vindication of Peter on the score of having gone in to men uncircumcised and eaten with them (11, 3) are certainly anticipations relatively to the story of Luke, as well as irreconcilable with the story of Gal. 2, 11-12. But in the relation in which they now stand to the persecution and death of Agrippa (12, 1-24) they are almost as flagrant anticipations in the Jerusalem source itself. It is only part of the truth to say that Peter in 9, 32-11, 18 has ceased to be domiciled at Jerusalem. Consideration of the extreme amplitude and detail with which Peter's call to preach the gospel to the Gentiles is here divinely sanctioned, and all objection silenced in a manner quite surpassing anything Paul could relate, makes it insupposable that the author continued by relating that after the Conclave ¹⁸ Peter merely settled down in Jerusalem until driven out by the persecution of Agrippa. The inference drawn by the Conclave, "Then to the Gentiles also hath God granted repentance unto life," looks forward to something greater. It is no more natural to think of Peter after all this going back and subsiding in Jerusalem to wait until Paul needs his testimony than it is to conceive the Council of Acts 15 settling all these questions over again after the Conclave of Acts 11, 1-18 has already settled them no less authoritatively and on a much broader basis. If, then, we place ourselves sympathetically at the original writer's point of view we shall see that *in the source* Peter after the Conclave must have followed the career implied in the utterance Luke himself places in his mouth in 15, 7: "Brethren, ye know how that God made choice among you that by my mouth the Gentiles should hear the word of the gospel and believe." Peter must not only have removed entirely from Jerusalem, taking his wife with him for extended journeys, as

¹⁷ For the broad appeal to divine principles seen in nature as superior to the conventions of Mosaic law, such as the distinctions of meats, compare Mark 7, 1-23 and 10, 1-10. "What *God* hath cleansed make not *thou* common" is an utterance cast in the same mould as "Ye make the word of God of none effect that ye may keep your tradition," and "What *God* hath joined together let not *man* put asunder."

¹⁸ The assembly of Acts 11, 1-18 is here distinguished from that of Acts 15, 1-35 by designating the former the Apostolic Conclave, the latter the Apostolic Council.

Paul expressly informs us in 1 Cor. 9, 5, but must have carried the gospel to the Gentiles in some such work of evangelization as is related in *The Preaching of Peter*, or in such an Apostolic progress to Caesarea and Antioch as the *Clementina* describe.

But granting that the Jerusalem source thus transferred to Peter the work which Paul tells us was explicitly recognized as his and not Peter's (Gal. 2, 7-9), why should it be necessary for Luke in employing it to make the alleged transposition? Try the experiment and the reason leaps to the eye. Place the two sections of the Jerusalem source in the order which consistency of internal development requires and the contradiction with the Antiochian source becomes unbearable. On the one side we shall have Jerusalem and the plain of Sharon from Joppa to Caesarea as the scene of expansion; on the other, Antioch and the provinces of Cyprus and South Galatia. On the one side a revelation of the Spirit sending Peter to the conversion of Cornelius; on the other a similar revelation sending Barnabas and Saul "to the work whereunto I have called them," which begins with the conversion of Sergius Paulus. On the one side a vindication of the evangelization of Gentiles by Peter accompanied by the "six brethren" of his new foundations in the plain of Sharon before the Jerusalem Conclave; on the other a vindication of it by Paul and Barnabas accompanied by "certain other" of the Antioch church before the Jerusalem Council. On the one side a settlement of the question on what terms a Jewish believer may "eat and associate" with "one of another nation" by deed and word — action corresponding to Peter's when he "ate with the Gentiles" at Antioch disregarding 'distinctions of meats' as man-made, coupled with a sweeping declaration that "God is no respecter of persons, but in every nation he that feareth God and worketh righteousness is acceptable to Him"; on the other a settlement of it on the basis of the four "decrees" of abstinence; which aim to protect the entire body, Jewish and Gentile, from the "pollutions of idols," and which imply the continued validity of the distinctions (ἐπάναγκες). On all points save the last it is the Antioch source which is substantially in the right, and the Jerusalem source which by the inexpugnable witness of the Pauline Epistles is in the wrong.

But it is simply inconceivable that any compiler should attempt to place the rival accounts of the great transition side by side, heedless of their flagrant inconsistencies. Unaltered, the two sources were incompatible. For such a compiler as Luke the remedy was self-evident. The course of Peter as related in the Jerusalem source must be in the main admitted (*cf.* 1, 8), but restricted in its application and treated as a mere precedent, pigeon-holed (as it were) until required for the ultimate solution. In short it was simply unavoidable that the story of expansion to the Gentiles in Acts 9, 32–11, 18 should be transposed, in spite of all its surviving implications of later and larger application, to the earlier time and more limited significance of Peter's occasional excursions from Jerusalem. The joint official action of Antioch and Jerusalem in the Apostolic Council must be, to Luke, the supreme and final settlement.

This admission of the claims of the Jerusalem source to the extent of conceding to Peter precedence over Paul as *inaugurator* of Gentile evangelization, while the actual work is *carried out* by Paul, involved Luke in two assumptions, both of which are flatly contradicted by Paul, and are more or less inconsistent with Luke's extracts from the sources themselves. *First*, he was obliged to transfer to Peter that title which was to Paul the very heart of his commission "not from men but from God," the title and commission of "Apostle to the Gentiles." Luke puts in Peter's (!) mouth the words, "God made choice among you (the Twelve) that by my mouth the Gentiles should hear the word of the gospel and believe." Paul is for him only the great "vessel of the Spirit" destined (when the way has been opened and the time is ripe) to carry on the work in partnership with Barnabas as commissioned evangelist¹⁹ of the church in Antioch. *Second*, Luke was also obliged to deny to Paul any attempt to evangelize Gentiles until after Barnabas had brought him to Antioch, and the two had been officially "appointed to the work whereunto God had called them." Such admissions as he makes

¹⁹ The title "Apostles" is restricted in Acts to the Twelve, and its conditions are so defined in 1, 21, 22 as to exclude Paul. The only exceptions are two references in the Antioch Source (14, 4, 14); but here Barnabas shares it with Paul showing that the missionaries are so called only in the ordinary sense, as 'delegates' of the Antioch church.

of preaching to the Gentiles before this time (Peter's special authorization excepted) are at least treated as questionable and unauthorized, if not denied altogether.²⁰ As we shall see, he appears even to have altered the reading of the Antioch source in 11, 20 to reach this result; while his treatment of the Hellenistic missions in his second 'panel' (chapter 8) is such as to indicate a determination to exclude if possible any actual admission of "men uncircumcised." How completely this puts his story in contradiction with Paul's own account in Gal. 1, 11-24 and 2, 1-10 needs no reiteration here. But the readers for whom Luke wrote were not supposed to consult Galatians; and if moderns do, they are quite content for the most part to do so with a veil upon their understanding, which whensoever Luke is read remaineth unlifted. On the other hand if Luke had carried his concessions to the Jerusalem source to the extent of adopting unaltered its representation of how the gospel was actually carried to the Gentiles he might perhaps have avoided contradicting Paul on the question of the "decrees" as the basis of protection from the "pollutions of idols"; but he would have robbed him of all that remained of his title to be called the Apostle to the Uncircumcision, and would have deprived Antioch of its chief glory as being the mother church of Gentile Christianity. As a compiler of discrepant sources, both of which obviously commanded high respect, and without access (as it would appear) to the great Epistles, it is difficult to see how Luke could have performed his task with greater skill or greater loyalty to each of his two great heroes.

We have again been compelled to digress at considerable length to the question of Luke's relation to his sources. But the bearing of the preceding considerations upon the Chronological Scheme of Acts will be at once apparent. Acts 12, 1-24 considered for itself alone, without reference to the preceding paragraph 11, 19-30 taken from the Antiochian source, would naturally be understood to cover a period of something over three years, viz., from Claudius' bestowal upon Agrippa of the authority, title, and territory of his grandfather, Herod the Great, early in 41, to the death of Agrippa in the (late?) summer of 44.

²⁰ See below, p. 155.

This may be somewhat obscured by the paragraphing in our printed texts and the sixteenth-century division into verses; but ancient texts such as the Codex Laudianus at Oxford make the division into lessons fall in the middle of 12, 19, the twenty-ninth lesson ending with the words "commanded that they should be put to death," and the thirtieth beginning, "Now he went down from Judaea to Caesarea and tarried there." Manifestly it was fully appreciated in ancient times that the story (apart from the editorial setting) assumes an interval of some length between the account of the crime against God's people and the judgment which ultimately befell the wrong-doer. In narrative for purposes of edification much longer intervals than this may be passed over without record for the greater sharpening of the moral, as when Hegesippus makes the besieging of Jerusalem by Vespasian follow "immediately" upon the martyrdom of the other James. Those authorities who, with Harnack, have perceived that in 12, 1 ff. the (original) writer is describing (quite correctly) the initial policy of Agrippa on his accession to power in Jerusalem, viz., an obsequious attempt to win the favor of the Pharisees without incurring too much obloquy from other elements or provoking Roman intervention, are on safer ground than those who date the persecution at the very end of Agrippa's reign; whether to reduce the discrepancy with the mention of the famine in 11, 27-30, or because they can see no room for an interval after 12, 19a. But the compiler of Acts as it now stands, if he has arranged the story of Petrine activity in its first half to cover three periods of five years each, undoubtedly intends his third rubric (12, 24) to mark the fifteenth year from the date assumed for the crucifixion. His introduction of a paragraph (11, 19-30) on the beginnings of Christianity in northern Syria is doubtless due to his desire to include within this period of the spread of the gospel from Gaza to the Taurus the founding and early years of the great church of Antioch. But his suppression of all deliberately purposed undertakings of Gentile evangelization until Antioch sends forth Saul and Barnabas on the First Missionary Journey (Acts 13, 1 ff.) is more than a forced harmonic device for the adjustment of conflicting sources. It coincides with Luke's own heart-felt conviction emphatically ex-

pressed throughout his work, and wide-spread in many forms in ancient Christian apologetic, that opportunity must first be given to the Jews to hear the message and repent, before it was right to "turn to the Gentiles." Ancient tradition, traceable to a period contemporary with Acts if not older, even specifies the duration of this special *locus poenitentiae* accorded to Israel. In a fragment of the so-called *Preaching of Peter* quoted by Clement of Alexandria, Jesus after the resurrection commands the Twelve as he sends them forth: "If any man of Israel willeth to repent and put his trust in God through the efficacy of my name, his sins shall be forgiven. *After twelve years* go forth into the world, that no man may say (in excuse), We did not hear." ²¹ Harnack is surely correct in maintaining that this tradition has not been without its influence upon the Lukan postponement of work among the Gentiles till the First Missionary Journey.

We need scarcely invite renewed attention to Luke's well-known inconsistency on this score with Paul. Galatians informs us with the greatest emphasis that from the moment of his conversion Paul had given himself systematically and exclusively to the conversion of the Gentiles. Acts describes all his work up to the time of his appointment by the church in Antioch as limited on principle to Greek-speaking *Jews*. It requires a special vision in the temple according to Acts 22, 17-21 to dissuade Paul from his attempt to labor in Jerusalem. According to Acts 9, 29, 30 he yielded only to mob violence when finally driven to take refuge first in Caesarea and thereafter in Tarsus. Even here nothing is said of work among Gentiles. Paul merely remains in hiding until summoned by Barnabas to Antioch. Luke goes so far, apparently, as to alter the reading of his source in 11, 20; for the context makes it quite obvious that the "men of Cyprus and Cyrene" who carried

²¹ Clem. Alex. *Strom.* vi, 5, 43. Von Dobschütz, who edits the fragments in *Texte und Untersuchungen*, xi, 1 dates the work so early as 90 A.D. The embodied tradition is probably older. It appears in several diverse forms (see Harnack, *Chronologie*, i, 243 f., 472 f.). In Harnack's judgment 90 A.D. is too early for the *Preaching* (which, however, he would admit to be identical with the *Teaching* (Doctrina) of Peter quoted according to Origen by Ignatius (*Smyrn.* 3, 2), but the "twelve year" tradition, which is calculated to end in A.D. 41 or 42 (persecution of Agrippa) "may well be historical" (p. 244).

the gospel to Antioch in the "tribulation that arose about Stephen" did *not* confine themselves to evangelizing Greek-speaking Jews (Ἑλληνισταί), but "spoke to the Greeks (Ἕλληνες) also." So clearly is this sense required by the context that all the later manuscripts, the ancient versions, and even modern translators adopt the reading "Greeks"; although the textual evidence is convincing that Luke actually wrote "Greek-speaking Jews" (Ἑλληνιστάς) as his theory requires.²² We may conclude, then, that he means the great transition to be marked by the persecution and death of Agrippa, both of which are related between the coming and going of Paul and Barnabas, and are immediately followed by the story of how they with Mark, whom they had brought with them from Jerusalem, were sent out on the First Missionary Journey. After this crisis in Jerusalem, Antioch, through these its commissioned agents, became the mother-church of Gentile Christianity. Luke's date for this turning point of Christian history, is, as we have seen, *fifteen* years from the crucifixion. That of his source was the traditional *twelve*. The difference arises from the fact that the Jerusalem source takes the persecution which resulted in the death of James, imprisonment of Peter, and affliction of others in the church, as marking the limit. As in the Antiochian source the martyrdom of Stephen and connected "afflictions" had spread the gospel abroad (8, 1, 4; 11, 19) so also in the Jerusalem source. The cup of Israel's obduracy is now made full and Peter is free to go "to another place" (12, 17).²³ Luke, on the other hand takes the death of the persecutor as his terminal point. The source, as Harnack has seen, contemplates a date shortly after the accession of Agrippa, early in 41, or, in other words "twelve years" after the crucifixion.²⁴ Luke knows, of

²² See B. B. Warfield, 'The Readings Ἕλληνας and Ἑλληνιστάς in Acts 11, 20,' *Journal of Biblical Literature*, iii, 113-127.

²³ An exodus of members of the conservatively minded Jerusalem church after the death of James in 41-42 falls in very well with Paul's reference in Gal. 2, 4 to the incoming of "false brethren who came in privily to spy out the liberty in Christ Jesus" enjoyed by Gentile Christians in Syria and Cilicia, an invasion which soon led (in 45?) to his appeal to the Pillars and the resulting Compact (Gal. 2, 1-10; cf. 6, 12).

²⁴ The source probably counts from Passover to Passover (cf. 12, 4), and therefore aims at an exact fulfilment of the traditional "twelve years." It is possible, however,

course, that Agrippa's death took place in the summer of 44, and assumes that the persecution to which it was the wrathful answer of God was but shortly before. Both source and compiler probably make Passover 29 A.D. their point of departure.

There would seem thus to be no doubt of Luke's intention to take the year 44 as the terminus for his third 'panel'; nor have we adequate reason to think of either more or less than five years as his conception of its duration.

4. If the theory we are testing be correct, the period between Acts 12, 24 (third rubric) and 16, 5 (fourth rubric), covering the First Missionary Journey and Settlement of the Mosaic Controversy, is also a period of approximately five years in the intention of the author.²⁵ The reason for the placing of the fourth rubric after the visit of Paul and Silas to the churches of the First Missionary Journey, instead of immediately at the close of the Jerusalem Council, is, of course, that the author follows the model of 11, 1 ff. in making the Council take its origin from this missionary adventure, instead of from the differences at Antioch whose beginnings are referred to in 11, 22, and whose culmination is described by Paul in Gal. 2, 11-13. The episode is therefore not complete until Paul and Silas have distributed the Council's "decrees" to these churches "for to keep" (Acts 16, 4). The decrees themselves, which solve the whole question of Jewish-Christians eating and associating with Gentile-Christians not subject to the Mosaic ordinances, by protecting both parties from "the pollutions of idols," are limited in their address to "the brethren who are of the Gentiles in Antioch, Syria, and Cilicia." They are *not*, therefore, intended for the distribution which Luke reports, and which is so notoriously difficult to reconcile with Paul's own settlement of the vexed question. The address calls for a slightly earlier date, before this important new province (South Galatia) had come into the foreground. We may reasonably suppose that they were drawn up at Jerusalem, at the instance of James, to meet the situation

that the Passover of the persecution is intended to be that of Agrippa's *second* year (42), in which case we reach a date for the crucifixion (A.D. 30) in better accord with the data of astronomy and the Jewish calendar system.

²⁵ Turner (*op. cit.* p. 422a) makes it end *ca.* November 1, 48; Ramsay (*Church in the Roman Empire*, pp. 65-73) in July 49.

created by the conduct of Peter at Antioch on the visit which Luke passes over in silence, but which Paul relates as occurring shortly after his compact with the 'Pillars' at Jerusalem. Of this visit we obtain a hint even in Acts; for Acts itself relates Mark's return to Jerusalem from Perga, midway of the First Missionary Journey, and mentions his renewed presence in Antioch just before the Second Journey (Acts 15, 37-38); but it fails to explain why, how, or with whom, he went from Jerusalem a second time to Antioch. We infer that it was with Peter.

At Antioch Peter adopted first the Pauline interpretation of the agreement with the 'Pillars,' that "the Jews which are among the Gentiles" shall be "as without the law," disregarding entirely the Mosaic distinctions, since the law as a whole is "done away in Christ." But the consequences of this example would be fatal to Jewish Christian 'purity' outside of Palestine itself. Wherever believing Jews found themselves "among the Gentiles" they would be "compelled" to Hellenize. Some sort of action at Jerusalem giving authoritative expression to the interpretation the Pillars put upon the Compact²⁶ was absolutely imperative if any hold whatever was to be retained upon "the Jews which are among the Gentiles." The Pillars' interpretation was entirely simple and intelligible: Gentiles are free from the law; Jews are bound. The natural — the unavoidable inference for men who did not appreciate or accept Paul's peculiar doctrine of "dying to the law" — was that some concession must be made by the "brethren which are of the Gentiles." Abstinence was "necessary" (*ἐπιναγκες*) from at least the four²⁷ things which involve "the pollutions of idols." Peter's action at Antioch called forth a delegation "from James" so authoritative as to overawe even Peter (*φοβούμενος τοὺς ἐκ περιτομῆς*), but who at the same time bore injunctions so plausible as to carry with them "even Barnabas" as well as "all the rest of the Jews" and (apparently) the entire Antioch church.

²⁶ We designate as the Compact the agreement described in Gal. 2, 6-10 as sealed by "right hands of fellowship."

²⁷ Three, if "things strangled" be a gloss.

We can find no other situation so perfectly adapted as this crisis of Peter's "eating with the Gentiles" at Antioch for the convening of the Jerusalem Council, which according to Acts 15, 12-35 makes final settlement of the entire question of the relations of Jews and Gentiles in the Church. It is true that neither Peter (whose conduct was in dispute), Paul, nor Barnabas can have been present; as indeed we cannot imagine Paul consenting to the compromise, or even recognizing the right of the Jerusalem leaders to "lay burdens," whether "greater" or smaller, upon his Gentile converts. Paul might well ignore the whole proceeding both in Galatians and later when minutely treating the whole subject for the Corinthians (1 Cor. 8-10), and less fully for the Romans (Rom. 14-15). On the other hand neither Peter, Barnabas, nor the church at Antioch would be likely to regard such action "from James" as *ultra vires*, since nothing more is intended than an application of the Compact as they must certainly have understood it ²⁸ to the specific case which had arisen through Peter's coming to Antioch. Least of all should we be surprised to find an Antiochian writer such as Luke, dependent upon Antiochian and Petrine sources, ignoring the unpleasantness which had taken place between his two principal heroes, and treating the Jerusalem Council as responsible for a complete settlement of the entire question, wholly satisfactory to all the parties concerned except the unauthorized advocates of circumcision who had "troubled (the Gentile believers) with words subverting their souls." As regards date, the Council falls toward the close of the fourth 'panel,' the distribution of the "decrees" in the cities of the First Missionary Journey being the last event narrated before the refrain of 16, 5. On the theory now in question this would correspond to the year 48 A.D. Such possible reference as may be found in Gal. 2, 12 to the same assembly presents no chronological obstacle. So far as the modern chronographer can judge, A.D. 44-49 appears to be unexceptionable as a date for this period, whether as regards the time needful for the incidents

²⁸ In the period of Augustine the understanding of the compact of Gal. 21, 1-10 is still correct: Gentiles qui in Christo credidissent legis onere liberos, eos autem qui ex Judæis crederent legi esse subjectos.

narrated as the author would be apt to view them, or absolutely, as fitting in with the course of events as otherwise known.²⁹

No other external data are available for the period save the famine, already considered.

5. In the fifth period, marked off by the rubrics of Acts 16, 5 and 19, 20, Luke is more generous than hitherto with indications of the lapse of time. It is the period of the founding of the Greek churches, with Corinth and Ephesus as the chief centres of Pauline evangelization. Acts 18, 11 informs us that "a year and six months" was the length of Paul's stay in the former centre, and Acts 19, 10 gives "two years" as the length of time for the evangelization of "all that dwelt in Asia" from the latter. In the speech of farewell to the Ephesian leaders at Miletus Paul sets "three years" as the period during which they had had opportunity to test his character. This doubtless is intended to include the "three months" of work in the synagogue before Paul "separated the disciples" (19, 8), and perhaps also the interval between his first coming (18, 19) and his return from a journey to Syria (18, 21-23). If we estimate at six months the time spent on the missionary journey through Macedonia and Achaia (Acts, 16, 6-17, 34), we shall probably do no injustice to Luke's intention. In Turner's reckoning the period covers almost exactly five years.³⁰ By absolute dating we should reach practically the same results starting from spring of 50 A.D. as the date for the Apostle's arrival at Corinth required by the Delphi inscription.

6. The starting point for the last period of Luke's story is Paul's departure from Ephesus for a final tour of confirmation of the Greek churches before the fatal journey to Jerusalem. If he really has a five-year division in mind it must extend, then, from A.D. 54 to A.D. 59. Now the journey to Macedonia and Achaia (19, 21), may be assumed to begin about Pentecost, as 1 Cor. 16, 8 shows to have been Paul's intention. It is followed the next winter by "three months" in Corinth (20, 3).

²⁹ The years 51 and 52 are not possible for the proconsulship of Sergius Paulus (Turner, *op. cit.*).

³⁰ From Passover A.D. 50 to the spring, A.D. 55, *op. cit.* p. 422a and b.

The earlier months of the next year (55 up to "Pentecost"; 20, 16) are spent on the journey to Jerusalem. They are followed by "two years" of captivity in Caesarea (24, 27) counting from "twelve days" after Pentecost A.D. 55 (Acts 24, 11). The prison days in Caesarea extend till the coming of Festus in 57. As Luke speaks only of intervals of "days" ("three days," verse 1, "eight or ten days," verse 6, "certain days," verse 13, "many days," verse 14) after the coming of Festus it is natural, though perhaps not necessary, to assume that he understands the journey to Rome, which began shortly before "the Fast," *i.e.*, about October 1, to have been undertaken the same year (A.D. 57). In this case Paul's arrival in Rome would fall early in A.D. 58 (Acts 28, 11-13). After this we hear of a period of "two whole years" during which he is permitted to occupy his own hired house without molestation, but no special event is mentioned as its terminus, and the book ends without a repetition of the summarizing rubric. It is possible, therefore, that there was less care in this case to make the division fall just five years before the end. At all events the numerous data cannot easily be put together without reaching a total of thirty years and nine months, bringing the story down to a final absolute date about February 1, A.D. 60.

To all this, external synchronisms such as the recall of Felix³¹ (A.D. 55-56 Harnack, 57-58 Turner) offer no obstacle. But what must be our verdict upon the proposal of Cadoux to regard the summaries of Acts as intended to divide the story into periods of five years each?

The fact that the closing periods of the two halves of the book bring us to points some months later than the starting point should be a warning not to look for a mechanical and rigid framework. It would have been easy for a compiler who desired to bring his material into such a Procrustean bed to count back from his closing date in such a manner as to make Paul's departure from Corinth (Acts 20, 3) the dividing line, and thus obtain a more exact proportion. The fact that he

³¹ The reference in Acts 24, 10 to Felix, "many years as judge of this people," may well include the period before his sole procuratorship, when he shared its responsibilities with Cumanus.

chooses rather the Apostle's departure from Ephesus, including the journey of confirmation through Macedonia and Achaia in the last 'panel,' shows that he prefers to group his material with reference to contents; for the preceding 'panel,' which began with the setting forth of Paul and Silas from the territory evangelized on the First Missionary Journey, is occupied throughout with the story of the founding of the Greek churches on both sides of the Aegean. On the other hand the Jerusalem Council (48) would have been a more natural terminus had he not really wished to complete the pentad from 44. At the lower limit the refrain of 19, 20 is followed by a proleptic forecast of the remainder of the story in 19, 21, giving conclusive evidence that to Luke's mind the new phase of Paul's activity represented by the journeys first to "Macedonia and Achaia," then "to Jerusalem," finally to "Rome," begins at this point.

On the whole it can hardly be accidental that the main division at 12, 24 so nearly subdivides the work chronologically into two parts of approximately fifteen years each, while each of these halves falls into three equal parts through the refrains of 6, 7 and 9, 31; 16, 5 and 19, 20. In all these cases five years is a probable allowance of time for the events narrated, and in those which we can best control the dates are found almost exact. If with Turner we take A.D. 29 to be Luke's starting point he will probably have set the crucifixion one year too early; but his central date, terminating the work of Peter, will extend but a very few months beyond the total of fifteen years, while 34 and 39 A.D. will be entirely appropriate termini for the periods of the founding of the mother-church in Jerusalem and of the spread of the gospel through "Judaea, Galilee, and Samaria" respectively. For the duration of the work of Paul described in the second half of the book Turner thinks it possible to fix "a period of fourteen years, certainly not less, and apparently not more." For this, however, he takes as the starting point not the rubric itself of 12, 24, but the appointment of Paul and Barnabas to their work of Gentile evangelization in 13, 2, making at this point "a considerable interval" to allow for the 'famine-relief' visit, which had been placed too early by Luke, and must necessarily come after (according to

Turner two years after) the death of Agrippa. This "considerable interval" must therefore be added to the period "certainly not less and probably not more than fourteen years" which in Turner's judgment represents the duration of the three 'panels' of the second half.

But it is not our present problem to determine the correctness or incorrectness of Luke's order. Our primary question is only whether, taking the story as he relates it, the events of 12, 25-28, 31 would reasonably fall within the compass of fifteen years. Since no such allowance as the several years assigned by Turner, but at most a few months are required for the interval between 12, 24 and 13, 2, we may take fifteen years as a very close approximation, perhaps the closest possible, to the period of time the historian had actually in mind. In addition we have already seen that the story of the founding of the Greek churches, closed by the rubric of 19, 20, covers as nearly as possible five years, and that of the beginnings of missions to the Gentiles, closed by the rubric of 16, 5, approximately the same period. It is difficult to deny the probability that the compiler of the work has really intended these divisions to mark some such periods of time.

The further question whether the Lukan chronology agrees with the Pauline, and how the data on both sides are to be adjusted to external dates with reference to obtaining an absolute chronology, is matter for later consideration. The preliminary step is perhaps not ill-advised of determining the chronological structure of Acts, taken as the author himself would appear to have conceived it. From the point of view thus defined the datings of salient events would seem to be substantially as follows:

Crucifixion	A.D. 29
Death of Stephen	34
Conversion of Paul	38
Escape from Damascus	38
Famineabout	44
Death of Agrippa	44
Visit of Paul and Barnabas to Jerusalem	44-45
First Missionary Journey	45-47
Jerusalem Council	48
Second Missionary Journey	49-51

Paul's Arrival in Corinth.....	January-March	A.D. 50
Three years in 'Asia'.....		51-54
Winter in Corinth.....	January-March	55
Arrest in Jerusalem.....	May	55
Imprisonment in Caesarea.....		55-57
Recall of Felix.....		57
Departure for Rome.....	October	57
Arrival at Rome.....	January-February	58
End of "two years" of semi-liberty.....	February	60

THE RELIGIOUS AND MORAL SITUATION IN FRANCE

VICTOR MONOD¹

PARIS

IN reading various American periodicals I have noted the interest with which French affairs are followed on the other side of the ocean, but American observers seem to be somewhat uncertain in their opinions about contemporary France and particularly to be baffled by the internal policy of France. For this policy differs profoundly from that which was pursued before the war. The attitude of the French government in religious affairs has been considerably modified. It may therefore interest American readers to learn something about the great currents by which the religious and moral spirit of France are today borne along, and to try to divine their probable outcome.

I

The dominant fact beyond question is the political supremacy of the peasant class. The destinies of France have always been subject to the influence of two very different social elements, the population of the cities and the population of the country.

The rural population has always been numerically by far the more important; France is essentially a nation of peasants. But before the war the political and intellectual guidance of the country was in the hands of the urban population, notwithstanding its numerical inferiority.

The French peasants, very industrious but often very poor, were engrossed in hard labor in the fields. The working-men and the people of the middle class filled the whole political

¹ M. Victor Monod, who at the request of the editors of the Review has written this survey of the present religious and moral conditions in France, visited the United States in 1917-18 with a delegation representing the French Protestant Churches. He served during the war as a chaplain in the army; and is now the minister of a large church in one of the residential suburbs of Paris.

stage, and their ideas and prejudices were taken to be those of the whole French people.

Fifteen years ago, in most of the cities, these ideas were in general anticlerical and even antireligious. There were societies of free-thinkers whose members pledged to one another their word of honor never to set foot in a church and not to summon a priest at the hour of death. It seemed self-evident that an intelligent man could not believe in God. M. Poincaré, the future President of the Republic, speaking of Professor William James's book on the *Varieties of Religious Experience* said in the French Academy: "We hear these narratives with the same kind of interest with which men listen to the tales of travellers recounting strange journeys in the heart of Africa!"

The rural populations retained more respect for the Church and religious things, but they were unable or unwilling to oppose the separation of Church and State somewhat rudely effected in 1906, by which all the churches of France were left in a very precarious situation from a legal point of view and prevented from creating for themselves a solid financial organization.

Now all at once the war has brought the rural population of France into the primacy of influence. It has gained this rank in the first place by its immense sacrifices. It was the peasants far more than the industrial laborers who shed their blood. Of one million four hundred thousand dead, one million were peasants.

In the smallest rural communes of France are to be seen to-day memorial monuments, inscribed with the long lists of those who died for their country. "Passer-by, bow thy head," reads a beautiful funerary stone erected in a little village in the valley of the Garonne, "There were sixty-five men of this village who died for thy freedom." The village had fifteen hundred inhabitants. In another village of three hundred inhabitants, twenty-two were lost. Of another rural commune, the schoolmistress wrote as early as April, 1916, "Here the men between twenty and thirty have all been killed except two."

But while the war carried off a million French peasants it did not a little to develop and emancipate this whole social

class, which is the prop and stay of French society. In his furloughs the peasant travelled everywhere in France; he is acquainted with Paris and the large cities where he was treated in the hospitals. He learned to handle the most delicate and the most dangerous weapons in the trenches. He knows the value of words and the value of things. Henceforth he will not allow his vote to be captured by lawyers from the town; he has his own ideas and looks for men to represent them.

And above all the French peasant has today large material interests to protect, for he has gained prodigiously in wealth.

During the war it was among the manufacturers and laborers in the cities, among the ammunition makers, that most of the profiteers and *nouveaux riches* were found; but since the armistice French industries have slowly become involved in difficulties, and the wages of the working-men in cities have been somewhat reduced, while the peasant has seen the price of the products of the soil steadily rise.

To stimulate the production of wheat, the government promised to buy the harvest at a price fixed in advance, and in 1920 this price was one thousand francs the metric ton, which was four times the price before the war. The French peasant has also rapidly freed his land from the mortgages by which it was encumbered, and has in very many cases become a proprietor. In one poor *arrondissement* the peasants in 1919 bought land to the value of ten millions of francs, in another *arrondissement* nineteen millions, and it is not an extravagant estimate that peasants invested in land in the course of the first year after the armistice three milliards of francs.

Thus France in 1921 is very different from that of 1914. The peasant, grown rich, has become a landed proprietor and profoundly conservative. The Chamber of Deputies elected in 1919 is the most conservative that has been seen for more than twenty years, and has in it the largest number of millionaire deputies. The influence of the city agitators has been completely annihilated by the resolute determination of the peasant class to secure social stability. The socialist party in France has lost much of its power. The railway strike attempted in May, 1920, totally failed, and resulted in the dissolution by

law of the General Federation of Labor, which was proclaimed amid popular indifference. The industrial crisis came in to accelerate the downfall of the French socialist party, now much divided and numerically greatly weakened. The true dictator is today the producer of wheat, milk, meat — the peasant of France.

II

The new situation has favored the growth of the influence of the Catholic Church. The Roman Catholic Church has always seemed to many Frenchmen to be the bulwark of order and social discipline, and as soon as the results of the legislative elections of 1919 were known, all those who felt which way the wind blew said, "France is going to re-establish relations with Rome."

The first argument that was offered in favor of sending a representative of the French Republic to the Vatican was excellent.

Since the separation of Church and State France has always had to have a semi-official representative to treat with the papal authority on certain matters. In its colonial expansion, for instance, France came into the possession of territories in which the religious interests of Catholics had been committed by the Pope to foreign religious orders. This was the case particularly with Morocco, where the Vatican had conferred on the Spanish clergy the exclusive right to exercise the functions of the Catholic ministry. It was necessary to negotiate directly with the Pope to obtain for French Catholic priests the right to exercise their functions in that French territory. And above all the victory of 1918, which restored Alsace and Lorraine to France restored to it a territory in which the Concordat signed by Napoleon in 1802, that is to say an agreement between the Pope and the civil government, was still in force. It was impossible to apply the Law of Separation to Alsace and Lorraine immediately. But it was equally impossible to leave things as they were because the bishops of Strasbourg and Metz, the two heads of the Catholic Church in Alsace and Lorraine, were of German extraction. It was indispensable

that they should be replaced by French bishops. And this result could not be brought about without conference with the Vatican, the only power competent to nominate Catholic bishops and priests.

Immediately after the armistice, Cardinal Amette, Archbishop of Paris, was sent by the French government to Rome to negotiate for the replacement of the two bishops. In this mission he succeeded, and on the 24th of April, 1919, the *Journal Officiel* of the French Republic published a decree signed by M. Poincaré and M. Clemenceau, naming Mgr. Ruch and Mgr. Pelt bishops of Strasbourg and Metz respectively.

Practical considerations of this sort made an impression on a great many deputies, including even non-Catholics, and it seemed to them essential from the point of view of foreign affairs that France should be represented at the Vatican, not as heretofore in a semi-official and precarious fashion, but officially by an ambassador.

This matter played a considerable part in the election of M. Deschanel to the presidency of the Republic. A certain number of Catholic deputies were bent upon securing a resumption of official relations with the Vatican. M. Clemenceau showed little enthusiasm for this project, and had declared in the lobbies of the Chamber, "With *that* Pope, never!" M. Deschanel, on the contrary, showed himself favorable to the plan, and this attitude brought him some additional votes which assured his election. Immediately after the election of M. Deschanel, Pope Benedict XV sent to the new president a congratulatory telegram.

A few weeks later, on the 11th of March, 1920, the government of M. Millerand introduced into the Committee of the Chamber an appropriation bill for the re-establishment of the embassy to the Vatican.

The discussion of the proposed law was however delayed for several months, and at one time it seemed as though it would have great difficulty in going through.

But at its session in November, 1920, the Chamber of Deputies formally decided to discuss the business at once, and on November 30 the government's bill for the establishment of

an embassy at the Vatican passed by a vote of 397 to 209. The discussion which preceded the vote on the bill was extremely interesting. It was easy to see that some deputies were in favor of it solely for reasons of foreign policy, while others on the contrary saw in the bill a new orientation of the internal policy of France. The Abbé Lemire, in particular, showed that one of the first consequences of the resumption of official relations with the Vatican would be the necessity of giving a legal status to the Catholic Church in France, and of modifying or complementing the Law of Separation of Church and State.

The Law of Separation of December 10, 1905, was a unilateral act; the Vatican never officially received a denunciation of the Concordat on the part of the French government. After the passage of the law, the French government ceased to pay a stipend to Catholic bishops and priests, and theoretically took no interest in their appointment. The Catholic churches were left at the disposal of the faithful by mere toleration. But in a legal point of view these edifices are in a very uncertain situation, and the destruction wrought by the war, which makes necessary the rebuilding of hundreds of Catholic churches in the devastated regions, has emphasized the precarious character of this situation. Whose property will those churches be, when they are rebuilt by the gifts of the faithful?

It is easy to perceive the danger of considerations of this kind. If France should modify the Law of Separation of 1905, discussions and controversies without number will arise and the public peace runs the risk of being seriously compromised. The operation of the law of 1905, notwithstanding all its defects, has given France religious peace. What would a modification of that law bring? All sorts of extravagant demands are possible. Certain Catholic deputies have already spoken of the necessity of giving to the Church an indemnity for the money loss which it sustained in 1905. They revive a claim long asserted in the Catholic Church, namely that the payment to Catholic priests and bishops by the French State is a debt which it owes them in compensation for the surrender of ecclesiastical properties in 1789. In short, there have reap-

peared in these discussions some of the most extreme claims of the Catholic Church, and the discussion leaves the impression that this bill might be followed by others no less important.

The President of the Council, M. Georges Leygues, has declared that the laws of the Republic are not to be meddled with, and that so long as he was the head of the government nothing should be done to impair them; but he was not willing to commit himself definitely in regard to the consequences of sending an ambassador to the Vatican.

In the course of the discussion one of the arguments most frequently advanced by opponents of the plan was the outrageously neutral attitude — at times even an attitude favorable to the Germans — of Pope Benedict XV. Neither the entreaties of Cardinal Mercier of Belgium nor the presence of an English minister, Sir Henry Howard, who was secretly intrusted with the interests of France, were able to bring the Pope to pronounce an explicit condemnation of the way the Germans carried on the war and their deeds of violence in Belgium.

Why should victorious France re-establish relations with the Pope who had refused to do her justice in the hour of peril?

Curiously enough a Catholic deputy, M. Louis Guibal, took it into his head to justify the reserved and timid attitude of the Pope during the war by comparing it with that of the American nation. He recalled the fact that France had to wait a long time for American intervention; that it had for many months by repeated and numerous missions to strive to interest the American people in the justice of the Allied cause. He recalled that President Wilson is reported to have said in church in New York that it was not in the power of any wise man to pronounce a judgment, and that the part of neutrals was to bring the enemies together, rather than to aggravate their quarrels by taking the side of any one of those who are engaged in the struggle.

Words, says M. Guibal, whose wisdom was not at that time disputed by anyone, falling from the lips of the man whose moral leadership seemed for a moment about to replace even that of the occupant of the Vatican, and become universal — words uttered in perfect good-faith, words which even now I do not assume the right to criticise, still less to condemn. I conceive

that at the moment when that great citizen uttered these words they corresponded, it may be to the ignorance in which he still was about certain facts, or to the profound conviction that a power of a moral order, when it is, and is bound to remain, neutral, was bound to preserve an equal respect for those whom it was not competent to condemn, if it had not in its hands the evidence which would permit it to do so.

This attempt to justify the too cautious attitude of the Vatican will probably surprise Americans as much as it surprised Frenchmen. If it be true that President Wilson long hesitated to take sides during the war, it is also true that when the facts made the right clear to him, he did take sides with the utmost determination, and that when the decision was once made, the American nation followed its President with an incomparable energy and will to win the war. On the contrary, no word, no deed, no crime could shake Pope Benedict's resolve to maintain silence. Our American readers will understand after this quotation how strongly resolved the French Catholic deputies are today to restore the moral prestige of the Pope in the face of public opinion which was alienated from him during the war. They will understand also how greatly public opinion in France has changed since the day when President Wilson was acclaimed in Paris. At that moment the moral supremacy of America in France was uncontested, and it seemed as if the Protestant powers, the United States and England, were going to give to European nations their own moral ideal.

The disillusionment caused by the refusal of the American Senate to ratify the Treaty of Versailles and become an active member of the League of Nations has led some minds to turn back to the Catholic Church, which on other grounds attracted all those who were alarmed by the spread of democratic ideas. The comparison drawn by M. Guibal has this much truth in it, that the moral leadership of Europe has already partially reverted from the American nation to the Roman Papacy.

There may be observed, in fact, a general campaign in Europe and in France, the object of which is to elevate the material position of the Papacy, and above all to give it political guarantees which at present it lacks. The dream of some would be to make use of the League of Nations to settle the territorial and political status of the Papacy. Thus, by an un-

expected turn, the League of Nations would serve to strengthen the position of the Vatican.

The following noteworthy declaration was issued in October, 1920, by the Catholic Press Bureau, which represents the most exalted aspirations of the French Catholic world:

The day may come when Italy would consent to have the status of the Papacy made the subject of discussions between the two parties, instead of being evolved by a Parliament, and when it was revised to have it receive the collective assent of all the Powers. The independence of the Pope would thus be guaranteed by the unanimous signature of all Christendom; it would assume the aspect, no longer of an Italian question, but of an international question. It would be one of those political realities in support of which the League of Nations would interpose with all the weight of its influence at any time when there was reason to apprehend that the territorial power installed in Rome might fail to keep its agreements. Political thinkers who have faith in the League of Nations are inclined to admit that under certain circumstances it might, in the name of certain principles of higher equity, limit the absoluteness of national sovereignty, and oppose the arbitrary exercise of such sovereign powers. A novel conception, certainly, and singularly contrary to the jealous claims of the old *Raison d'Etat*! But Italy would give a good example to the world by accepting this friendly coöperation of the League of Nations for the moral security of Christian opinion. A great step would then be made toward the establishment of the *Pax Romana*.

This *Pax Romana* encounters, it is true, vigorous resistance in France itself. The law providing for the sending of an ambassador to the Vatican filed in March, 1920, was not passed by the Chamber of Deputies until November 30. It still awaits ratification by the Senate, and it does not seem that the ministry of M. Briand is in any great haste to see it carried through. Most probably it will be enacted by a small majority; but the opposition of those who are against the resumption of official relations with the Vatican will deprive this result of much of the significance the proposal at first seemed to have. It will remain an act prompted by foreign policy, and will not mark a radical modification of the religious policy of France. It is extremely unlikely that France will ever adopt a Catholic policy, seeking to create in Europe a Catholic *bloc* by an alliance with the populations on the Rhine, Bavaria, and Austria, concluded under the auspices of the Vatican, as some have unwisely dreamed. France will continue as heretofore to make of its entente with England and the United States the basis of a

democratic and progressive policy. The republican form of government is above all attacks, and cannot hereafter be overthrown. The war has indeed taught the French Republic the importance of religious and moral factors in the world. The heads of the French government are today more regardful of the influence of the churches — the Protestant churches as well as the Roman Catholic Church — and are more polite in dealing with the powers of the churches. They will send an ambassador to the pope. But no one could dream today of extinguishing the proud spirit of intellectual independence and the liberal convictions of French citizens. France will remain the great democratic hearth-stone of Europe, the nation that best preserves its poise between autocracy on the right and demagogic anarchy on the left.

III

While social and political circumstances are thus in certain ways favorable to progress in the churches of France, it must not be forgotten that a grave difficulty threatens to paralyze their efforts, namely, the acute difficulty in the filling up the ranks of the clergy. Catholic churches and Protestant churches alike are today confronted by the same difficulty — heavy losses in men through the war, lamentably insufficient support for the ministry. In the country the recruiting of the clergy has almost completely stopped. While a peasant earns very large wages, the Catholic priest sometimes receives only six francs a day, and a Protestant pastor with a family to support, ten or twelve francs. Here also the war, by bringing the whole male population of France in contact with city life and disclosing to them all the gains of industrial callings, broke up the traditions of country life. The children of the soil no longer set their ambition on entering the ranks of the clergy. In certain rural dioceses the recruiting of the Catholic clergy has sunk almost to zero. Aged priests are serving two or three parishes; what will happen after their death? Cardinal Amette said, "Give us priests, churches, schools, but above all priests!"

The war, it is true, developed a mind for religious things in a great many men who lived for long months with the thought

of death daily present to them. This has led many grown men to the religious calling. The great Catholic Seminary of Paris has in 1921 about 360 students, a number which it had never before reached. And what is still more remarkable, among these 360 students there are 85 who had already made their start in another profession. We find among them a colonel of the general staff, fifty officers of the army, four naval officers, six engineers, manufacturers, tradesmen, etc. The resort of students has been so great that it has been found necessary to decline to admit forty foreign applicants of English speech and numerous Orientals. Thus the large cities are furnishing numerous candidates of every age to the priesthood, and if the recruiting of the Catholic clergy taken as a whole remains insufficient, it may be hoped that the lack of numbers may be compensated in a measure by the quality of the recruits.

The Protestant churches have had a similar experience. They also have difficulty in finding pastors for the country churches. But upon the benches of their seminaries also sit officers, men wearing the ribbon of the Legion of Honor, grown men laying aside a profession upon which they had already entered to serve the church. The number of theological seminaries has been raised since the armistice from two to three; Strasbourg having been added to Paris and Montpellier. And in addition to the seminaries, various theological schools have been opened especially for the training of evangelists, missionaries, young women, and the like. The number of students of Protestant theology in 1921 is materially larger than 1914, it reaches almost 150 — a high figure, when it is remembered that the number of active pastors is only 1100. But these recruits do not yet suffice to make good the losses of the war, nor the exodus of those who leave the ministry for lay professions that yield a less inadequate support. The rural population has not yet come to the point of making sufficient sacrifices to keep their churches alive and secure to their ministers a situation worthy of their calling.

By degrees priests and pastors slip toward the cities, while the country parishes are deserted, in part by reason of the

indifference and avarice of their inhabitants. In this there is a great danger for the future. If the country population of France should cease to be Christian, if the principles of justice and brotherly love should cease to be held in honor there, the moral equilibrium of France would be greatly imperilled; it would be ready for all sorts of revolutionary adventures.

This peril is perceived by very many, and the French Christian youth of today is far from being apathetic and indifferent. Students in the universities and the higher schools frequently feel themselves called to a sort of temporary apostolate. They take to posting bills, distributing tracts, holding lectures, writing for the press, in behalf of the good cause. In Protestant circles in Paris the movement, *La Cause*, gathers a steadily increasing number of enthusiastic students, men and women, who devote all their leisure to spreading evangelical principles. Parisian Catholic circles have devoted themselves to the *Œuvres de Midi*, or professional *Guildes*, which bring together in each quarter young women who leave their places of work between noon and two o'clock for their mid-day meal. These guilds include a lunch-room, besides rest-rooms and halls for lectures. They have a strictly confessional and Catholic character, and priests preach short sermons in them. There are at present the *Guilde St. Mathieu*, open to the employees of banks; the *Guilde Ste Marie de l'Aiguille* for dressmakers; the *Guilde Ste Madeleine* for the girls in perfumery shops; the *Guilde St. Honoré* for those who are employed in food shops. In all these groups there are zealous, faithful souls, ready to make all sacrifices for their associations.

Thus contemporary France has in the religious field the same difficulty as in all other fields of national activity — a lack of men for middling and obscure places. In the cities there is a blossoming out of enterprises, and an enthusiastic and zealous body of youth; but the great rural masses are as yet untouched by these movements. A considerable number of young people from the cities go, it is true, to find in the country remunerative positions, and they contribute to raise the intellectual level of the inhabitants of villages. The future will belong to

those who know how to elevate and direct the spirit of the French peasants. These peasants, more enlightened, better off, and with greater desire for knowledge, need intellectual and moral leaders of the first quality, filled with truly apostolic faith and zeal. When they shall have them, France will resume an eminent place, if not the foremost, in the intellectual and moral world.

The friends of France may be reassured. The country has almost recovered its mental equilibrium. The sound traditions of labor among its peasants have preserved it better than any other country in Europe from the social Utopias that frequently follow a great war. The Russian revolutionary propaganda has completely failed, and the moderate and conservative elements are much more powerful than before the war. There was even for a moment reason to apprehend that France might abandon its high liberal traditions to submit to the yoke of Rome. But that will not be. A prouder and a truer conception of the spiritual independence of the state and of the churches is already gaining ground. France will find a way to give to the Catholic Church, as to the Protestant churches, a legitimate place; not an unfavorable place as in recent years, and not a privileged place such as some have imagined. The spiritual forces, like material forces, of the nation are weakened, and in particular it will require years to train all the spiritual leaders of whom our youth has need. At no moment of the war was the moral quality of France seriously impaired. That collapse of all ideals which our enemies expected as the prelude of French defeat never came. Gratitude for this is due to all those who were the spiritual educators of the nation, and who kept its soul up to the level of the exigencies.

In the years which are to come, France, always eager for new inspirations, will be looking for guides in the world of thought and faith. May the influence of America, so enthusiastically exalted among us in 1918, and still so beloved, so potent in France, be among those which shall assist our country to form for itself high ideals of spiritual greatness! It is not to no purpose that France has recently sent one of its most famous

generals to render homage to the memory of the Pilgrims of the Mayflower. Wherever in the world moral greatness, liberty, and heroism are to be found, France desires to be present and to receive the lessons of history. The uniting of the spiritual patrimony of the two great republics may save the world of tomorrow just as the uniting of their material forces saved it yesterday.

NOTES

A PAPYRUS MANUSCRIPT OF THE MINOR PROPHETS

Among the parchment and papyrus manuscripts and fragments brought to this country by the University of Michigan Expedition under Professor Francis W. Kelsey, only one is of paramount interest to the Biblical scholar. There are indeed lectionaries and parts of lectionaries dating from the eleventh century and later, and even a single papyrus fragment of a Psalm, but the former are uninteresting textually, and the latter is too small to give much evidence.

The papyrus manuscript of the Minor Prophets formed a part of a previous purchase made in Egypt in 1916 for Mr. J. Pierpont Morgan and Mr. Charles L. Freer. Transportation was too hazardous to permit of bringing the manuscripts to America at that time. They were packed in a tin case which was sealed by the American consul and placed in the vault of a bank in Cairo.

After the armistice no one interested in the manuscripts was able to visit Egypt until last year, when the work of the University of Michigan Expedition brought Professor Kelsey to Cairo. The case containing the manuscripts was received and opened by him. On account of their fragile nature all the manuscripts were taken by Professor Kelsey to Rome, where the material obtained for Mr. Morgan, chiefly Coptic, was delivered to Professor Hyvernât. The Greek papyrus was forwarded through the American Embassy to the Library of the University of Michigan, where it will remain until the editorial work has been finished. It will then be placed in the Freer Gallery in Washington, to which the Greek parchment manuscripts in the Freer Collection have already been transferred.

There remains of this manuscript 28 leaves, written on both sides, and rather numerous fragments. The size of the leaves is at present about 5 inches wide by 9 inches long. A little margin is preserved in places on each side and at the bottom, but at the top the margin and 9 or 10 lines are missing. As 38 or 39 lines are preserved on most pages, the original manuscript probably had 48 lines to the page. The length of the line is four and one-fourth inches, and it contains on the average about 30 letters. If we allow for an inch of margin all the way around, the original size of the leaf was about 6 by 12 inches.

The manuscript appeared at first sight to be in book form, but no traces of binding were found, nor had there been any in the period immediately preceding the burial or loss of the manuscript.

When I opened the manuscript the pages were photographed as the leaves were separated, being numbered 1, 1^v, etc. When the leaves thus numbered were compared with the Greek text, I found that two leaves, 14 and 15, had been turned over together without affecting the neighboring ones, and leaves 20 and 21 had been turned over separately so as to bring the backside of each first. At the time this happened it seems likely that there was no binding. In fact it may well be that there never was a binding, but that these long, narrow leaves were kept in a pile and perhaps numbered to keep them in order. The length of the sheets, the broad column of writing, the crowding of the writing, all point to a special effort to keep the manuscript, or rather the pile of sheets, as thin as possible. A manuscript of such a form may well have been kept and carried about in a box or wallet, as the Irish missionaries carried their Bibles.

I have made no attempt as yet to read and place the fragments. The entire leaves give the text from Amos 7, 9 to Malachi 2, 9, with the lacunae caused by the missing tops of the leaves. The manuscript has a small number of accents, all seemingly from a later hand. They are in general accurate, and are similar to those now in use. Punctuation is more frequent, both single and double dots occurring, and these likewise seem to be from a later hand. Iota adscript appears infrequently, as does the rough breathing in the half H and square forms, both from the hand of the original scribe as well as from a corrector. Dots over initial iota and upsilon and an apostrophe after proper nouns ending in a consonant are rare and from first hand. There are many corrections, some from a hand probably contemporary, others from one later. Both used good sources. Abbreviations are rather infrequent, only *κύριος*, *θεός*, *άνθρωπος*, *πνεύμα*, and *ισραηλ* being regularly abbreviated.

The writing is a sloping uncial of the oval type, but more cursive than any literary manuscript of like size that I know except parts of Aristotle's Constitution of Athens. Papyrus publications of the past thirty years have furnished a wealth of examples of this sloping hand which was once called rare and late. It is fairly common from the first century to the seventh, and the so-called Slavonic uncial on parchment is its direct descendant. The types of this hand in use in the Roman period, *i.e.*, up to about 350 A.D., and in the Byzantine, are easily distinguishable. The exaggerated size of some letters, and

the cruder, heavier stroke, mark the later period. Our manuscript belongs in the Roman period, and not at its very end; though more cursive in character, it compares well in breadth of letter and in character of stroke with many third century examples. In the sloping hand of the second century the letters are somewhat broader.

The odd mixture of cursive and literary characters in a hand which is plainly trying to avoid cursive makes the hand hard to date exactly. A good document to compare is No. 72 of Vol. II of the Amherst Papyri, Plate xviii, from the year 246. Our manuscript does not use the cursive forms of most letters consistently, and it sometimes varies, offering other cursive forms not found in No. 72. Yet the general resemblance combined with characteristic forms of certain letters point to a third century date. Thus *omicron* is consistently small, sometimes appearing as a mere dot, and never equal in size to the other letters. The *sigma* regularly has a flat top which does not bend forward or droop. A form of *kappa* shaped like a small cursive U is of frequent occurrence. Also other cursive forms of less frequent use point to a third century date. A facsimile of one page of the manuscript has been given in the Michigan *Alumnus* for February, 1921. I am sure that the manuscript can not be placed later than 325 A.D., and I am at present inclined to date it in the second half of the third century.

One expects much from the oldest existing manuscript of any considerable portion of the Bible, and I believe we shall not be disappointed. Its value can be suggested by a few noteworthy readings drawn from different places in the text.

In Micah 1, 15, the reading is $\eta \delta \omicron \xi \alpha \tau \eta \varsigma \theta \upsilon \gamma \alpha \tau \rho \omicron \varsigma \text{ } \text{I} \varsigma \rho \alpha \eta \lambda$, but $\text{I} \varsigma \rho \alpha \eta \lambda$ was carefully crossed out by the third hand, which has done much good correcting in the manuscript. The corrections by this hand do not seem to represent conjectures but manuscript authority. In this passage we might assume that $\text{I} \varsigma \rho \alpha \eta \lambda$ has been deleted because of a misplaced obelus belonging to $\theta \upsilon \gamma \alpha \tau \rho \omicron \varsigma$, but there is, I think, a better explanation pointing to an older text. In the Aldine edition and some later manuscripts $\Sigma \omega \nu$ stands for $\text{I} \varsigma \rho \alpha \eta \lambda$. It is a commonplace of textual criticism that such variations often point to an earlier omission, which we now find in this old papyrus manuscript. It is not necessary to assume that the omission was original in the Septuagint, though it may have been. The expression, "until the glory of the daughter shall come to Odollam," suggested the completion "daughter of Zion," if not "daughter of Israel." Any family of manuscripts omitting the word would naturally have it supplied by

conjecture, if there was no manuscript handy in which it could be found. Its deletion in our manuscript indicates a desire to keep to the simpler and so perhaps older form of text.

In Micah 4, 3, the Papyrus reads *τας ζιβυνας* for *τα δορατα*. The manuscripts A, Q*, 26, 40, 49, etc. support this reading, as does also the Syro-Hexaplar. Likewise Justin Martyr cites this passage with *ζιβυνας* in his text. The word *ζιβυνη* with its parallel forms *σιβυνη*, *σιγγυνη*, *συβανη*, etc. was common in Macedonian Greek. It means a hunting-spear or any light spear. It was a dialectical word, but one sure to be known throughout the empire of Alexander. It occurs in the Septuagint in three other passages, Isaiah 2, 4, and Jeremiah 6, 22, without variant, and in Judith 1, 15, where some manuscripts spell with a sigma. The common word *δορυ* is found over fifty times in the Septuagint, and so is apt to have been substituted for the rare *ζιβυνη* by later scholars.

In Micah 7, 12, this manuscript has *Συριας, ημερα υδατος και θορυβου* for *και απο θαλασσης εως θαλασσης και απο ορους εως του ορους*. The Alexandrinus adds *Συριας* at this point and the rest of the substitute as an addition after *ορους*², being supported in the latter addition by many cursives; while Q* agrees with our manuscript in giving this reading as a substitute for the regular text, which has however been added in the margin by Q². The common reading agrees well with the Hebrew, from which this variant represents a decided departure. The fact that it omits the second and third parallels, "from sea to sea and from mountain to mountain," tends to show its primitive character. The first parallel in the Septuagint, "from Tyre to the river," does not match well with the others, for it seems to be individual while they are general. A double interpretation of the Hebrew was noted as possible by Hieronymus. If the second and third parallels are omitted, such an addition as *Συριας* seems necessary to make the sense complete. As regards the addition, "a day of rain and confusion," we can only say that it is Hebrew in style and fits in well with verses 11 and 12. The form in our manuscript and in Q* shows less inconsistency than that in the other manuscripts of the Septuagint, which may argue for its primitive character. In any case we see here a parallel to the standard Hebrew text and not a derivative from it. All manuscripts showing both expressions, as the Alexandrinus, are of a secondary character.

In Obadiah vs. 16, is found the addition *πιονται παντα τα εθνη οινον* before *πιονται*, as in N², A, and some later manuscripts, while Q and

others are reported for a different order. This addition conforms to the Massoretic text, makes the Greek more intelligible by adding the necessary subject for *πινονται*, and what is more important, forms a stronger verse. When we consider that we can explain the regular Septuagint text as an ordinary omission by homoeoteleuton, the jump from *πινονται*¹ to *πινονται*² causing the loss of 23 letters, or about a line of an ancient manuscript, it seems best to consider the longer form original in the Septuagint.

In Zephaniah 1, 3, after *θαλασσης* is the addition *και σκανδαλ[α συν ασεβειν]*, but the same hand or one of about the same time has deleted the phrase with a small dot over each letter. Hieronymus and cod. 86 mg. testify that this addition is from Symmachus. It is found also in the minuscules 36, 238, and 240. The fact that it was deleted in our manuscript, probably by the diorthotes, shows that it was recognized as an addition, perhaps marked as coming from Symmachus, and so was deleted.

In Zechariah 14, 17, the papyrus adds at the end, *και ουκ εσται επ' αυτοις νετος*. It is supported here only by the Aldine edition, codd. 36, 51, and a few others. We know from Hieronymus that this is approximately the true translation of the Hebrew as given by Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion. Aquila seems to have had *ομβρος* for *νετος*. Again we may have the rendering of Symmachus or an independent adaptation to the Hebrew appearing in our manuscript, but this time it is conflate and not deleted.

In Zephaniah 3, 10, our manuscript reads *δεομενοι μου εν [τοις δ]ιεσκορπισμενοις* for *προσδεξομαι εν διεσπαρμενοις μου*, but the addition was deleted by dots over most of the letters. The manuscripts A, Q, 26, 49, etc. omit from *προσδεξομαι* to *μου*, which is marked by an asterisk in the Syro-Hexaplar. It is from Theodotion. Symmachus as quoted by Theodoret is quite different. Aquila is not preserved for this verse. The form in our manuscript is so good, and agrees so well with the Massoretic text, that it seems best again to assume that a gloss drawn from another translation of the Hebrew has crept into the text. The fact that this also is deleted tends to confirm the surmise that the glosses were so marked that the diorthotes detected them. Perhaps a phrase from the translation by Aquila has been preserved here.

In Habakkuk 3, 1, we find *υπερ των αγνοιων* added after *ωδης*. This is a translation of the Hebrew, as we see from Hieronymus, who quotes Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion. Yet *αγνοιων* is not

found there, the nearest approach being *αγνοημάτων* found in two of the translations. Either some unknown translation or the original Hebrew has influenced our manuscript at this point.

In Zechariah 1, 3, this manuscript omits the first *λεγει* *Κυριος των δυναμεων* and *των δυναμεων* of the second. The first of these expressions is omitted elsewhere only in the Holmes and Parsons cursives 36, 40, 49, etc., and the second in 130, 239, 311. *ⲛ** has the first *λεγει* *Κυριος* with *παντοκρατωρ* for *των δυναμεων*, but all were deleted by the second hand and *παντοκρατωρ* deleted a second time by the third hand. Also for the second *των δυναμεων* we find *παντοκρατωρ* in A, Q, 26, 40, etc. Yet the Syro-Hexaplar marks both with an asterisk as derived from Theodotion. Our manuscript alone preserves the original Septuagint in both cases, though it is supported by the second hand of *ⲛ* for the first omission.

In Zechariah 11, 13, this manuscript adds *κη* (for *και*) *καθηκα* before *και ενεβαλον*. It is supported only by codd. 61, 62, 86, and some others. This is considered a case of repetition or double interpretation, but in fact the meanings are hardly similar enough to warrant this conclusion. Neither do Aquila nor Symmachus have this verb, though both are preserved. I have so far found no case where this manuscript reproduces a reading from Theodotion. As given here the whole sentence may be interpreted: "And I took the thirty pieces of silver and sent them down (or, went down) and cast them into the house of the Lord into the smelting furnace." If we assume that this represents, not a double interpretation, but an older form of the Hebrew text, it is not hard to understand why the Massoretic and the later translations should have succeeded in eliminating the phrase from the Septuagint manuscripts, especially when assisted by such a corrupt form as appears in this old papyrus.

In Zechariah 13, 1, this manuscript, supported by Q and four cursives, omits the whole phrase, *και τοις κατοικουσιν το χωρισμον*. B^a, *ⲛ*¹, 86, 22, 23, 238, mark it with asterisks or similar signs. As the Syro-Hexaplar also marks it as an insertion from Theodotion, there can be no question that our manuscript preserves the correct text, though with little support.

In conclusion I may add what has been hinted by the above discussed readings. The new manuscript almost never goes with B¹ when it is opposed by the other old uncials. Its nearest relative is Q, though it lacks much of Q's later material. At times it goes with the later cursives only. The first scribe made a good many mistakes which were later corrected; both forms will be instructive. Thus far the

manuscript seems free from the influence of Theodotion, Origen, and the later editions. On the other hand it is going to give us a clearer insight into the amount and kind of corruption which preceded Origen.

HENRY A. SANDERS

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN
ANN ARBOR, MICH.

CEPHAS AND PETER IN THE EPISTLE TO THE GALATIANS

In his note 'Simon, Cephas, Peter' in this *Review* (January, 1921, pp. 95-97), Professor Kirsopp Lake, calling attention to the existence of early evidence that in some quarters Cephas was thought to be a different person from Peter, wonders why "Christian tradition has so completely lost sight of these doubts, which were clearly present in various forms to Clement of Alexandria and to the still earlier writer of the *Epistola Apostolorum*."

As a matter of fact Christian tradition never lost sight completely of these doubts. This was due primarily to controversial reasons which led the expositors of the New Testament to attempt edifying explanations of the quarrel of Cephas and Paul at Antioch related in the Epistle to the Galatians. It seems that very early dissenters from the great church made the most of that episode to belittle the value of the unity and consistency of the Apostolic tradition boasted by the *καθολικὴ ἐκκλησία*. Of the Marcionites, for instance, Tertullian says: "Proponunt ergo ad suggillandum ignorantiam aliquam apostolorum, quod Petrus et qui cum eo reprehensi sunt a Paulo . . ." etc. (*De praescr. haeret.* 23), and again: "Ipsum Petrum caeterosque columnas apostolatus a Paulo reprehensos opponunt, quod non recto pede incederent ad Evangelii veritatem" (*Adv. Marcionem*, i, 20; iv, 3; v, 3). It seems that Porphyry also made caustic comments on the apostolic quarrel: "Porphyrio . . . blasphemanti, qui Pauli arguit procacitatem, quod principem Apostolorum Petrum ausus est reprehendere et arguere in faciem . . ." (Jerome, Ep. cxii, 6, ad Augustinum); and finally the emperor Julian accused Peter of hypocrisy: *κατασκώπτει δὲ πρὸς τοῦτοις τῶν ἁγίων ἀποστόλων ἕκκριτον Πέτρον ὁ γεννάδας καὶ ὑποκριτὴν εἶναί φησι, καὶ ἐληλέγχθαι διὰ τοῦ Παύλου, ὥς ποτε μὲν τοῖς Ἑλλήνων ἔθεσι διαζῆν σπουδάζοντα, ποτὲ δὲ τοῖς Ἰουδαίων, ἡννοηκῶς εἰσάπαν τὴν ἐν γε τοῦτοις εὐτεχνεστάτην οἰκονομίαν* (Cyril of Alexandria, *Contra Julianum*, lib. ix. P. G. lxxvi, 1000-01).

The passage of Clement's *Hypotyposeon* quoted by Eusebius (*Hist. Eccles.* i. 12, 2) states that the Cephas who was rebuked by Paul in Antioch was not Peter, but one of the Seventy Disciples. It seems therefore that Clement was following a different tradition from that represented by the *Epistola Apostolorum* and by the so-called Kirchen-Ordnung, both of which make Cephas one of the Twelve, but other than Peter.¹ We must not forget, however, that Eusebius's quotation from the *Hypotyposeon* is not beyond doubt, in view of the fact that according to Rufinus (*Apol. pro Origene*) and Photius (*Bibl. Cod.* 109, p. 9, P.G. ciii, 383) this book had been interpolated by heretics of all kinds. This doubt is strengthened by the fact that Origen, who belongs to the same circle with Clement, ignores the tradition that counted Cephas as an independent member of the Twelve, and identifies him with Peter (*Comm. in Joann.* xxxii, 5. P. G. xiv, 753). According to Jerome, Origen was the first to propound the theory that the dispute of Peter and Paul in Antioch was κατὰ πρόσωπον—it was an "*honesta dispensatio*," that is to say a preconceived plot between the two Apostles in order to give a forceful lesson to the Judaizers of Antioch: "Hanc explanationem primus Origenes in decimo Stromatum libro ubi Epistolam Pauli ad Galatas interpretatur et caeteri deinceps interpretes sunt secuti" (*Ep.* cxii, 5). Among those who followed Origen, Jerome expressly mentions "Didymum videntem meum,"² et Laodicenum de ecclesia nuper expressum (Apollinaris) et Alexandrum veterem haereticum, Eusebium quoque Emisenum, et Theodorum Heracleotem" (*Ep.* cxii, 4). But the most famous of all those who adopted Origen's view was John Chrysostom, who in a sermon on the passage κατὰ πρόσωπον αὐτῷ ἀντέστην, ὅτι κατεγνωσμένος ἦν (Gal. 2, 11) mentions that there were some who taught that the man rebuked by Paul was not Peter, the first of the Apostles, but somebody else: Οὐκ ἦν οὗτος Πέτρος, φησὶν, ἐκεῖνος ὁ τῶν ἀποστόλων πρῶτος, ὁ παρὰ τοῦ Κυρίου τὰ πρόβατα πιστευθείς, ἀλλ' ἕτερός τις εὐτελής

¹ The list of the Apostles given in the *Epistola Apostolorum* and in the Kirchen-Ordnung is certainly curious. It is fair to say, however, that almost all the traditional lists found in various periods and various places present very strange combinations. The main tendency was to preserve the number Twelve, but at the same time to include in the Twelve Paul and the Evangelists. In the iconographic tradition of the sixth century (Theodoricus' Mausoleum) the list is as follows: Peter, Paul, Andrew, James, John, Philip, Bartholomew, Matthew, Mark, Luke, Thomas, Simeon, and the same list although in different order appears in the *Ἑρμηνεῖα τῶν Ζωγράφων* which was for centuries the source book of painters and artists. See G. de Jerphanion, *Quels sont les douze Apôtres dans l'Iconographie chrétienne?* in *Recherches de Science Religieuse*, Sept.-Dec., 1920, pp. 358-367.

² A play on "Didymus the Blind."

καὶ ἀπερῥιμμένος, καὶ τῶν πολλῶν εἰς (P. G. li, 380). As for himself Chrysostom rejects this opinion and affirms the identity of Cephas and Peter.

It is worthy of remark in this passage from Chrysostom that, according to the theologians whose opinion he criticizes, Cephas was a despicable person; the disparaging words *ἐτέλης καὶ ἀπερῥιμμένος, καὶ τῶν πολλῶν εἰς* could hardly be applied to one of the Seventy. Had Chrysostom a different source from Eusebius? Neither Chrysostom nor Jerome mentions the names of those who, following Clement's view, denied the identity of Cephas and Peter; but from Jerome's words it is clear that at least one of those who had written extensive replies to Porphyry adopted this opinion: "Ad extremum si propter Porphyrii blasphemiam alius nobis fingendus est Cephas, ne Petrus putetur errasse, infinita de scripturis erunt radenda divinis, quae ille qui non intelligit criminatur" (*Comm. in Gal.*, P. L. xxvi, 341). Was he aiming at Methodius of Olympus or at Eusebius of Caesarea, both of whom are known to have written treatises against Porphyry? This question cannot be settled, because both those works are completely lost.

In the pre-Nicene Christian literature of the West there is no hint of the slightest doubt about the identity of Peter with the man who quarreled with Paul in Antioch. The fact that in the current Latin versions of the New Testament the name Cephas was always translated by Peter prevented any question on this point. As a matter of fact, Tertullian (in the passage quoted above) and Cyprian never name Cephas, and explain Peter's conduct as a remarkable example of concord and patience given to the hierarchy: "Petrus . . . documentum nobis concordiae et patientiae tribuens. . . ." (*Ep.* lxxi, ed. Hartel III, ii, 773). Origen's bold exegesis of the *κατὰ πρόσωπον* was unknown in the West. Hilary of Poitiers (*in Ep. ad Gal.*, Pitra, *Spicilegium* i, 58-59) and Ambrose (*in Ep. ad Corinthios* i, 5, 4 and *in Ep. ad Gal.* ii, 11, P. L. xvii, 229, 350) follow Cyprian's line of thought. Jerome was the first who tried to introduce the interpretation of the "*honesta dispensatio*" in the West, but Augustine emphatically opposed an exegesis which made of the dispute of the apostles a little pious comedy for the instruction of the Judaizers of Antioch. This question led to an exchange of somewhat sharp letters between Jerome and Augustine, written not without *rancore stomachi*, as the former himself says. Augustine's view eventually prevailed, and Jerome later on recanted (*Adv. Rufinum*, 3, 1. See Möhler, *Gesammelte Schriften* i, 1 ff.).

Augustine does not mention Cephas, but he confesses that his sources of information about the dispute of the Apostles were limited, "haud plures de hoc argumento legi et audiui Patres quam Ambrosium et Cyprianum." Jerome as we have already noticed was acquainted with the opinion that Cephas was not Peter: "Sunt qui Cepham cui hic in faciem Paulus restitisse se scribit, non putant apostolum Petrum, sed alium de septuaginta discipulis isto vocabulo nuncupari. . . . Quibus respondendum, alterius nescio cuius Cephae nescire nos nomen, nisi eius qui et in Evangelio et in aliis Pauli epistulis et in hac quoque ipsa, modo Cephas modo Petrus scribitur" (*Comm. ad Gal.*, P. L. xxvi, 341).

Two centuries later, Gregory the Great in his Commentary on Ezekiel repeats the same statement: "Sunt vero nonnulli qui non Petrum Apostolorum principem, sed quondam alium eo nomine qui a Paulo sit reprehensus accipiunt, qui si Pauli studiosius verba legisent, ista non dicerent" (*In Ezech. Lib. ii, Hom. vi, 10, P. L. lxxvi, 1003*). We have no evidence that in Gregory's times there were Western expositors who held such an opinion; it is probable therefore that Gregory was simply repeating what he read in Jerome. In the East, on the contrary, it seems that about that time the Clementine-Eusebian view was very much in favor; it is explicitly stated in the so-called *Chronica Alexandrina*, or *Chronichon Paschale*, a compilation made under the Emperor Heraclius (610-641) by putting together old lists and documents of various origin. According to the *Chronica*, the Cephas rebuked by Paul was one of the Seventy Disciples: Κηφᾶς ὁ μῶννυμος Πέτρον ᾤ καὶ ἐμαχίσατο Παῦλος κατὰ Ἰουδαϊσμοῦ (P. G. xcii, 521). The same statement is made in the famous *Σύγγραμμα ἐκκλησιαστικόν*, a forgery of the eighth century published under the name of a Dorotheus, supposed bishop of Tyre and martyr of an early persecution, a mythical personage who never existed. The purpose of the forgery, which purported to be an account of the careers of the Apostles and of the disciples of Jesus, was to give an historical color to the legend of the apostolic foundation of the See of Constantinople, with the apostle Andrew as first bishop. This choice seems to have been suggested by the fact that Andrew was called by Jesus to the apostleship earlier than his brother Peter. In the distribution of churches made by the *Σύγγραμμα*, Cephas also got a bishopric: Κηφᾶς ὃν ὁ ἀπόστολος Παῦλος ἐν Ἀντιοχείᾳ ἡλεγεξεν ὃς καὶ ἐπίσκοπος Κονίας ἐγένετο (P. G. xcii, 1065).

In the tenth century we find again a commentator on the Epistle to the Galatians, Oecumenius bishop of Trikka (Thessaly), who agrees

with this tradition and quotes Eusebius in support of his opinion (P. G. cxviii, 1112).³ The same tradition has the adhesion of Salomon Chalatenzis, Bishop of Bassara (Syria), in a treatise, "De praedicatione Apostolorum et de loco uniuscuiusque eorum, deque eorum morte," written about 1222 (Assemani, *Bibliotheca Orientalis*, iii, 319). Finally it found its way into the Greek Menologia, and acquired right of citizenship in the eastern ecclesiastical tradition.⁴

In the West, as it is easy to imagine, Augustine's teaching prevailed, and was constantly followed down to the fifteenth century. It is only occasionally that the opinion that Cephias and Peter were different persons is mentioned, and then only to be rejected. Such is the case with a commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians written by Hervé, abbot of Bourgdieu (Herverus Burdigalensis, 1100-1150), who repeats *ad verbum*, although without quoting the author's name, Gregory in *Ezechielem*: "Sunt vero nonnulli qui non Petrum," etc. (P. L. clxxxi, 1145).

Hugo of St. Victor (*Exegetica*. i. In S. Scrip. Quaestiones in Ep. Pauli in Ep. ad Gal. Quaestio vi.) and after him Aquinas (*Comm. in Ep. ad Galatas*. Opera, ed. Parma, xiii, 396-397) and all the great Scholastics had no doubt of the identity of Cephias and Peter, although they were acquainted through Jerome with the opposite opinion. They discussed at a great length "an (reprehensio haec) fuerit vera, an dispensatoria, et an peccaverit Petrus et vere reprehensibilis fuerit," adding to it a series of considerations "de tempore quo licuit legalia observare et de observatione legalium quantum ad Apostolos," and a detailed exposition of the controversy between Jerome and Augustine, with a conclusion in favor of the latter: "Salva reverentia secretorum, Beati Augustini sententiam preferimus" (Hugo of St. Victor, P. L. clxxv, 556).

During the controversies provoked by the Reformation the dispute at Antioch acquired a new importance in relation to the question of the primacy of Peter.⁵ Some Catholic theologians, like those

³ The writings which go under the name of Oecumenius have rather the character of an anthology compiled in a casual form.

⁴ In the Synaxarium Constantinopolitanum the commemoration of Cephias is assigned to December 8 together with other disciples (Propylaeum ad Acta SS. Novembris Synax. Eccl. Cplitanae, opera et studio H. Delehaye. Bruxellis, 1902, col. 290). In the *Menaea* edited in Venice in 1592, the commemoration is found March 30 (*Ib.* col. 574).

⁵ On the importance given by the early Protestants to the incident of Antioch, see K. Holl, 'Der Streit zwischen Petrus und Paulus zu Antiochien in seiner Bedeutung für Luthers innere Entwicklung,' *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, xxxviii (1919), pp. 23-40.

of the fourth century of whom Jerome speaks, thought that the best way to dispose of the question for good and all was to exhume the old opinion of Clement and Eusebius: Cephias was not Peter, but one of the Seventy. (A. Pighe, *Hierarchiae Ecclesiasticae Assertio*. Coloniae 1538. Lib. iii, Cap. 11, f. 100. "Quae ex Paulo objiciuntur, dissolvere." Hardouin, *Commentarius in Novo Testamento*, Amsterdam, 1741, Appendix: Petrus et Joannes vindicati. i. Cepham a Paulo reprehensum Petrum non esse, pp. 785-799).⁶ Suarez (Lib. ix, *De lege Divina*, c. 20. Opera, vi, 530-542) and Bellarmine however, remain faithful to the Augustinian view (*De Rom. Pont.* i, cap. xvi. Op. i, 347).

Most theologians of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries followed Pighe and Hardouin, and tried to strengthen their assumption not only by making appeal to the old tradition, but also by a long series of historical and theological arguments. (Vallarsi, Notes in his edition of the Opera S. Hieronymi, Venice 1766-72, vii, 408 seq. reprinted in P. L. xxviii, 340; Zaccaria, *Dissertazione su Cefa ripreso da S. Paolo*: Diss. varie. I, 195; Roma 1780; M. Molkenbuhr, *Quod Cephas Gal. II, 11, non sit Petrus*. Apud Monast., 1803; A. F. James, *Dissertations ou il est irréfragablement prouvé que St. Pierre seul décida la question de foi soumise au Concile de Jérusalem et que Cephas repris par St. Paul à Antioche n'est pas le même que le prince des Apôtres*, Paris 1846; A. Vincenzi, *Lucubrationes biblicae*, Pars ii, 87, et seq.; I. Neubauer S. J., 'De Legibus,' in *Theologia Wirceburgensis*, Tom. v, 258-265.)

The most important of these arguments was furnished by chronol-

⁶ Jean Hardouin, Jesuit, was the editor of the "Conciliorum Collectio Regia Maxima" (Paris, 1715-25). His "Commentarius in Novum Testamentum" was published after his death. The appendix "Petrus Vindicatus" is divided into 20 chapters, dealing with the exegetical and the historical sides of the question. The fifth chapter assumes that if we grant that Cephas was Peter, we must conclude that Peter was guilty of heresy: "Immunem ab hereseos labe Petrum non fuisse, si reprehensus ipse a Paulo est." The sixth goes even so far as to affirm that all faith in Scripture would be upset if we admit the identity of Cephas and Peter: "Periclitari ac mutare ipsam sacrorum literarum fidem videri si Petrum a Paulo fuisse reprehensus damus." This excess of zeal led to the condemnation of the *Commentarius*, which was put on the Index. Hardouin was incensed by the fact that not only Protestant historians (like the Centuriatores Magdeburgenses) but also Jansenist writers (like P. Quesnel, *La Discipline de l'Eglise* i, 224-229) put great stress on the incident of Antioch as giving evidence that Peter's (and therefore the Pope's) decisions were far from being unimpeachable. He shows no less irritation against the Greek editions of the New Testament, which like that published in Holland in 1638, for the reading Κηφάν in Gal. 2, 11-14, substituted Πέτρον, which reading, he says, "habetur a Graecis (schismaticis) pro authentica."

ogy and had been already sketched by Hardouin. Starting from the theory of the twenty-five years of Roman episcopate of Peter, these theologians concluded that Peter must have been in Rome not later than the year 42 A.D.; on the other hand it was only in the year 44 that Paul went to Jerusalem and there met for the first time Cephas, with whom *junxit dexteram*. This Cephas could not be Peter, who at that time was in Rome. But there is no doubt that the Cephas who five years later in Antioch was rebuked by Paul was the same man that Paul had met in Jerusalem, therefore he cannot be identified with Peter, although about that time Peter returned to Jerusalem, to preside over the council of the year 50.

The Vatican Council of 1870 and the discussions about the infallibility of the Pope gave a new interest to the question. But modern Catholic theologians, realizing how weak is the chronological argument based on legendary data, have abandoned Cephas to his fate, and have gone back to Augustine and the old tradition of the western Fathers. (Palmieri, D., *De Romano Pontifice*, Prati, 1902, pp. 372-73. Mazzella, C., *De Religione et Ecclesia*, Prati, 1905, pp. 692-693. Straub, *De Ecclesia Christi*, i, 135. Innsbruck, 1912.) They accepted the identity of Cephas and Peter, but found in the episode of Antioch a new argument in favor of the infallibility of the Pope: "Huiusmodi facto evidentiter se prodit Petri primatus. Quamvis enim Paulus verbis doceret non esse opus iudaizare, Petrus autem solo conversationis exemplo videretur docere esse iudaizandum, hic tamen ceteros ipsumque Barnabam *cogebat*, non tantum alliciebat iudaizare. Unde tanta efficacia exempli taciti Petri, ut praevaleret doctrinae praedican-tis Pauli, nisi ex eo quod ab omnibus Petrus potior Paulo habebatur eiusque auctoritas suprema esse in Ecclesia credebatur?" (Palmieri, *op. cit.* p. 374.)

G. LA PIANA

A SYRIAC PARALLEL TO THE GOLDEN RULE

Numerous parallels to the Golden Rule of Matt. 7, 12 and Luke 6, 31 have been found in various writers.¹ Most of these are Jewish or Christian, but some of them are far remote in time and place from

¹ Cf. Wettstein, *Novum Testamentum*, i, pp. 341 f.; A. Resch, in *Texte und Untersuchungen*, x (1897), 3, pp. 80 f.; G. Resch, *ibid.*, xxviii (1905), 3, pp. 132 ff.; Heinrici, *Beiträge zur Geschichte und Erklärung des Neuen Testaments*, iii (1905), pp. 85 ff.; and Proost, *De Bergrede* (1914), pp. 153 f. To the passages cited in these works may be added the following: *Mahabharata*, xii, 259, 20: Quod quispiam non vult sibi ab aliis

Judaism and Christianity. Sometimes the precept is put in the positive form and sometimes in the negative, more frequently in the latter. A Syriac parallel, particularly interesting because it combines the two forms, seems to have been hitherto overlooked. It occurs in the philosophical dialogue entitled *The Book of the Laws of the Countries*, and is as follows: "For there are two commandments set before us, which are meet and right for free-will: one, that we should depart from everything that is evil and we hate to have done to ourselves; and the other, that we should do whatever is good and we love, and are pleased to have it done so also to ourselves."²

The Book of the Laws of the Countries is traditionally ascribed to Bardesanes, but is really the work of one of his disciples, who probably wrote in the early part of the third century after Christ. The author may have read, in Syriac or in Greek, a text of Acts 15, 20 or 29 having the Golden Rule in the negative form after the prohibitions, and combined this with the positive form found in Matt. 7, 12 and Luke 6, 31. Ephrem's commentary on Acts 15, 29 is based on a text similar to that attested by D 25 29 etc., *sah, syr. hl.*, Iren. int., Cyp. Bardesanes may have thought of the positive and negative forms of the Golden Rule as constituting "the perfect law of freedom" mentioned in James 1, 25.

Christian scholars are wont to dwell upon the superiority of the positive form, whilst Jewish writers either prefer the latter³ or regard the two as substantially equivalent. Thus Montefiore has "a feeling that Hillel and Jesus meant pretty much the same thing."⁴ Elbogen thinks that Jesus derived the saying from Hillel through tradition, and he finds no special merit in the positive form of statement.⁵ The truth is that both forms of the precept are based on love to our fellowmen (Lev. 19, 18), which according to Akiba as well as to Jesus is the fundamental principle of conduct. On the negative side love "worketh

fieri ne ipse aliis faciat, quia scit quid odiosum sit. Thales (Diog. Laert. i, 36): 'Ερωτηθὲς . . . πῶς ἂν ἄριστα καὶ δικαιοῦτατα βιώσαιμεν [ἔφη] ἔὰν ᾧ τοῖς ἄλλοις ἐπιτιμῶμεν, αὐτοὶ μὴ δρῶμεν. *Ep. Arist.* § 168 (ed. Wendland): 'Ο δὲ νόμος ἡμῶν κελεύει, μήτε λόγῳ μήτε ἔργῳ μηδὲνα κακοποιεῖν. Aphraates, *Demonstratio*, xxiii, 62 (*Patrologia Syriaca*, I, ii, 129, ll. 14 f.): "What you dislike when done to you do not do to your fellow." This is word for word the way in which Hillel is said to have summarized the Law (Sabb. 31a); cf. the Palestinian Targum on Lev. 19, 18; and Akiba in Aboth de R. Nathan, c. 26 (ed. Schechter, Recension B, p. 27).

² Cureton, *Spicilegium Syriacum*, p. 5; *Patrologia Syriaca*, I, ii, 551, ll. 11 ff.

³ Cf. e.g. Hirsch in *The Jewish Encyclopedia*, vi, p. 22.

⁴ Montefiore, *The Synoptic Gospels*, ii (1909), p. 550.

⁵ Elbogen, *Die Religionsanschauungen der Pharisäer* (1904), p. 76.

not evil to the neighbour," and hence it is the "fulfilment of the Law."⁶ On the positive side, as in Jesus' parable of the Good Samaritan, love manifests itself in generosity and helpfulness to others. The negative form of the commandment teaches men to be just, whereas the positive bids them to be generous.⁷ The difference between justice and generosity is well expressed by Wettstein: "Iustus est, qui reddit quod debet, quodque etiam ab invito per iudicem extorqueri poterat: bonus sive beneficus, qui liberaliter dat, quod non debet."⁸

WILLIAM H. P. HATCH

THE EPISCOPAL THEOLOGICAL SCHOOL
CAMBRIDGE, MASS.

"STRAIN OUT A GNAT AND ADORN A CAMEL"

In the late Professor Camden Cobern's useful book entitled *The New Archaeological Discoveries and their Bearing upon the New Testament* a section is devoted to Tatian's Harmony of the Gospels, and on pages 205-207 a list of its remarkable readings is given, according to the Arabic text published by Ciasca. The list is misleading, for many of the supposed examples of variation from the standard text are not such in reality. Hamlyn Hill's English translation, on which Cobern relied, is not always correct, and the Arabic translator himself was sometimes unfortunate in his rendering of an ambiguous Syriac word or phrase.

The singular reading quoted above, however, which is one of those given in the list, is not to be laid to the charge of Professor Cobern or of either translator, but is due to an extraordinary combination of two transcriptional or typographical errors, which so far as I am aware has not been observed by any one. Ciasca's Latin rendering of Matt. 23, 24 (p. 71) has indeed "*camelum ornantes*." His Arabic text of the passage (p. 153) has the word *yazdarūna*, which means neither 'they adorn' nor anything else which could possibly be used here. It is at once plain that the true reading was *yazradūna*, 'they swallow.' (I see that Rendel Harris, cited in Hill's translation, had noted this, and doubtless other scholars have made the observation.) Ciasca, however, must have read the word correctly, for his '*ornantes*'

⁶ Rom. 13, 10.

⁷ So also Bruce in *The Expositor's Greek Testament*, 7th ed., i, p. 132.

⁸ Wettstein, *op. cit.*, ii, p. 46.

can only be a miswriting, or misprint, of the word *vorantes*, 'swallowing.' This coincidence of two typographical slips, the one in the text and the other in the rendering of the same word, could not easily be paralleled.

CHARLES C. TORREY

YALE UNIVERSITY
NEW HAVEN, CONN.

FROM ABRAHAM TO DAVID, FOURTEEN GENERATIONS

In a note on Matt. 1, 17 in the January number of this Review, I remarked that to squeeze the fourteen generations from Abraham to David into a period of four hundred and ninety years it was necessary to ignore the biblical chronology, which demands nearly twice as long. Professor Louis Ginzberg has suggested another possible explanation. In Yebamot 64b, Rabbah (b. Abuha), a Babylonian teacher of the third century, observes that it was in the days of David that the years of a man's life were first reduced to seventy (Psalm 90, 10). This inference from the Psalm might have been drawn at any time; and if it was current in the circle from which the genealogy of Jesus in Matthew comes, the author may not have applied his thirty-five year scheme to the generations before David.

GEORGE F. MOORE

CAMBRIDGE, MASS.